

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE FACTS ABOUT BEEF PRICES

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, all of our people are very much concerned about the constantly increasing cost of living. Almost every month, the Government releases figures which show that prices have again gone up in our country.

One of the items which has received much attention in the discussion is rising prices of food and one food item discussed very frequently is meat. My State of Alabama has one of the Nation's fastest growing beef cattle industries. Alabama Cattlemen's Association, consisting of some 12,000 members, is concerned about what it feels is some unfounded criticism of current beef prices. For that reason, it has published a pamphlet to be most interesting and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

ABOUT BEEF PRICES—"LET'S TELL IT LIKE IT IS"

Alabama cattlemen are becoming increasingly alarmed and concerned over the attention that is being focused on beef prices. There appears to be a tendency in some quarters to blame beef prices for the inflation trend that has hit every area of the American economy—and certainly not beef alone.

Cattlemen in general feel it is time to "Tell it like it is"—to tell the consumer that the price of beef—like the price of a new car or tractor is the byproduct of inflation, *not its cause*.

When a cattleman is confronted with the statement, "Beef prices sure are high," he might well respond "Compared with what?"

The following facts might provide some of the answers:

1. Live cattle prices are now about the same as they were in 1951, while the cost of operating a cattle ranch or farm has increased more than 110 per cent during the same period.

2. Retail prices of beef are about the same now as they were in 1951—while the average take home pay for a worker has increased about 150 per cent in that 20 year period. Beef prices on the average have not increased more than 15 per cent at their highest peak in the last 19 years.

3. If live cattle prices had gone up as much as wages since 1952, American housewives would be paying about \$3.00 per pound for steak.

4. The American housewife spends only 16½ per cent of her disposable income for food—the lowest in the history of the United States. In Europe she spends 30 per cent, while in Russia it is about 50 per cent.

5. Any increase in the price of beef has occurred for the same reasons prices have increased in every other industry in the country—inflation and labor.

6. One hour of labor in 1970 will buy seven pounds of ground beef, as compared to 4.2 pounds in 1951.

Cattlemen and farmers must make a profit or they no longer stay in business. The production of food and fiber is essential to every citizen. It is unfair to blame cattlemen and farmers for high prices. The cost of packaging, processing and retailing Beef has sky-

rocketed due to inflation. These costs represent a major portion of Beef prices at retail.

Beef provides one of the highest forms of protein, which every healthy person must have. Cattlemen offer no apology for their business. They pledge their best efforts to produce good wholesome beef in abundant supply—but they believe they are fair to expect a profit from their endeavor.

Cattlemen receive—and ask—no special favors. They believe strongly in free enterprise, receive no government aid, and constantly fight any forms of government controls, other than those concerning health and quality standards. Cattlemen believe strongly they can supply the country with an abundant supply of top grade beef at a reasonable price in keeping with the times.

All they ask is understanding and that the blame for beef prices be placed on inflation and not blame inflation on the price of beef.

A WORLD ECOLOGICAL SYSTEM

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it is very important for us as a nation to maintain an interest and concern for our environment similar to that generated during the week surrounding Earth Day last April 22.

A Washington Post article of April 1, written by Richard N. Gardner, a Columbia University professor of law and international organization, serves to remind us of an added dimension to our ecological concerns—that is, the need for all nations to view the cleansing of the global environment as a common venture. Professor Gardner underscores the potential role of the United Nations in this truly worldwide program.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Toward a World Ecological System," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1970]

TOWARD A WORLD ECOLOGICAL SYSTEM

(By Richard N. Gardner)

Our new concern with the environment has focused so far on domestic problems. We have largely neglected the international dimension. But we are finally beginning a systematic look at our global environment in a new U.N. committee preparing for a world conference in Stockholm in 1972.

A U.N. response to the environmental challenge is long overdue. While some measures to deal with the environment can be taken by individual nations alone, there are resources that do not belong entirely to any nation—the sea, certain lakes and rivers, migratory animals—whose effective management requires international cooperation. Even management of the environment within the confines of a single nation may benefit from the sharing of national experience.

Moreover, we are finally beginning to recognize that how a nation deals with its national environment is no longer its own and nobody else's business. We are beginning to comprehend the unity of the world's eco-

logical system, which means that all nations may be affected by how any one of them treats its air, water, and land.

We are gradually awakening to the realization that all mankind depends on the same scarce and relatively shrinking resource pool, and therefore has an interest in the wise husbanding of resources wherever they may be located. And business firms around the world are beginning to argue that they cannot accept the additional costs of anti-pollution unless their overseas competitors do the same.

For all these reasons, the international community will be increasingly involved in environmental issues—even those that have hitherto been regarded as "domestic." Indeed, the most powerful impetus to world order may no longer be the threat of nuclear war, but rather the urgent necessity of new trans-national measures to protect the global environment.

President Kennedy asked the General Assembly in 1963 for a U.N. effort to deal with environmental problems—but nobody was listening. Although President Nixon mentioned the environment in his address to the Assembly last fall, his only proposals for international action have been made in NATO. As an organization of limited membership whose principal function is military defense, NATO is not well suited to be the centerpiece of our effort in this field.

The global environment concerns all nations, regardless of national, ideological, or racial differences. Some work on the environment can be usefully undertaken in regional agencies like OECD, but a universal problem needs a universal system of organizations to deal with it. The U.N. system, including its regional commissions and specialized agencies, is the nearest thing to a universal system we have. The Stockholm Conference provides an additional reason to make it more universal by admitting mainland China and divided states. At the very least, the U.N. should invite the Peking regime, the two Germanies, the two Vietnams and the two Koreas to participate in the Stockholm meeting.

What exactly can the U.N. do about environmental problems? To begin with, it could undertake a massive program to educate the world's people, particularly political leaders, on the problems of the environment; could sponsor joint research efforts and studies; and could finance the training of specialists to handle different environmental problems.

It could organize a world-wide observation network, using observation satellites and other new technology, to monitor the world's environment on a continuing basis, and it could operate a service for the evaluation and dissemination of this information for all nations.

It could encourage the negotiation of international agreements providing for firm anti-pollution and other environmental commitments so that nations and industries accepting their environmental responsibilities suffer no competitive disadvantages in international trade.

It could ensure that multilateral aid programs are carried forward with due regard for their environmental implications, and could encourage the application of environmental safeguards in bilateral aid. (Downstream erosion from the Aswan Dam, we now discover, may wash away as much productive farm land as is opened by the new irrigation systems around Lake Nasser.)

Finally it could establish a U.N. Program for the World Heritage, including scenic, historic and natural resources now in danger of destruction whose survival is a matter

of concern to all mankind. Obviously, each nation would be free to decide whether or not to nominate a property within its territory for inclusion in such a U.N. program. At the same time, the community of nations would be free to decide whether or not to accept it.

Countries whose resources were included in the program would gain the advantage of international advice and financial aid in their development with consequent benefits to their economies as a whole. And the world community would be in a position to protect unique and irreplaceable properties—Venice, Angkor Wat, some of the great wildlife reserves of Africa—in whose survival all mankind has a common interest.

ARMS TALKS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a commentary captioned "Topics: Arms Talks and Mutual Verification," published in the New York Times of Saturday, June 13, 1970. The author is Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, of Brandy, Va.

Admiral Strauss, a former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, is, in my judgment, one of the ablest and one of the most farsighted citizens of our Nation.

I have known Admiral Strauss well for many years. He has served his nation ably and unselfishly.

He was a close associate of former President Hoover; he was a trusted adviser and close friend of former President Eisenhower; and he is a friend and confidant of President Nixon.

Admiral Strauss has superb judgment, and I know of none more conscientious and more dedicated to the welfare of his nation.

While Admiral Strauss discusses several subjects in the article published below, I am particularly interested in his comment on the strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union now being held in Vienna.

I am a member of a seven-man subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee charged with the responsibility of keeping abreast of these talks. The chairman of the subcommittee is the able Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

I invite the attention of Senators to the thoughtful and provocative article by Lewis L. Strauss.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 13, 1970]

TOPICS: ARMS TALKS AND MUTUAL VERIFICATION

(By Lewis L. Strauss)

For the past twenty years—ever since we discovered that the Russians had developed the atomic bomb—we have lived in its shadow. The menace has grown so great that negotiations for arms limitations and control are the most crucial and urgent enterprise in which our Government is engaged.

In the pre-nuclear era, the incentive to negotiate was disarmament for the sweet sake of peace. Since Hiroshima, the incentive has become much more personal—disarmament for the sake of survival. It is safe to assume also that both sides of the negotiating table are now familiar with the consequences of continuing failure, a familiarity which may not have been equally apparent when we offered the Baruch Proposal in the United Nations in 1946.

The nature of atomic warfare also imposes a new consideration for the negotiations—a sense of urgency, for in this era surprise attack is possible in a manner which would make our experience at Pearl Harbor seem like an event in slow motion.

In his recent comprehensive report to the Congress on foreign policy, the President enumerated certain "clear principles" which the Administration would observe in future negotiations with the Communist states. These, he pointed out, were the result of "lessons" learned in postwar negotiations with them. Not included here in the report, though later named, was a principle which had been essential to our program prior to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

INSISTENCE ON INSPECTION

That principle was emphasized by President Eisenhower during his last months in office when he said: "The United States has made proposal after proposal, each in good faith, in an effort to reduce tensions of the world and to lessen the economic burden of armaments. Moreover, we are prepared always to consider any reasonable proposal made by others. But on one point we must never waver—and that is our insistence that agreements toward disarmament be accompanied by sound methods of inspection and control. The absolute necessity of this caution is readily understood when one recalls that the government with which we must deal in these matters has, since 1945, broken an uncounted number of solemn agreements made with us and other nations of the free world."

Three years later, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, representing the Kennedy Administration, told the General Assembly of the United Nations that "where national security is concerned, an open society cannot undertake with a closed society an arrangement which cannot be verified."

Yet the Test Ban Treaty which we ratified the following year lacked that provision. The history of that negotiation includes a "lesson," for, in its course, the principle of verification finally disappeared under steady whittling by the Soviets and concessions by us. Starting with our insistence upon unlimited inspection as a mutual right, it dwindled by stages to the point where we were willing to accept seven inspections a year—a number insufficient for effective verification in the large areas involved. Finally, with the Test Ban Treaty of 1963, the principle of mutual inspection for verification was abandoned.

Many will remember the jubilation with which ratification of the Test Ban Treaty was welcomed. President Kennedy expressed his pleasure and his confidence that the Treaty would "slow down the nuclear arms race." Yet since its ratification in September of 1963, there have been many subterranean nuclear tests by the Soviets and ourselves, and entire new weapons systems have evolved for the delivery of nuclear weapons on distant targets. The euphoria of 1963 was not warranted.

SECURITY FOR BOTH SIDES

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviet Union have reconvened in Vienna. A reasonableness which we may prayerfully hope was not "mere atmospherics" seems to have been evidenced in the prior rounds of talks. If so, the principle of verification,

abandoned in 1963, ought now to be revived in mutual interest. President Nixon has stated that "An agreement to limit strategic arms can be lasting only if it enhances the sense of security of both sides."

And if it be true that the Russians are as distrustful of us as we are of them, then mutual verification would do more to allay mutual suspicion than any other provision of an arms limitation and control agreement, however solemnly covenanted.

A LITTLE GIRL IN LAOS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an article that appeared in *Twin Circle*, a national Catholic magazine. It appeared in the June 7 issue below a picture of a very young Laotian girl and is an excellent commentary on the recent history and the present political and military situation in Southeast Asia and on our position with respect to it.

The article follows:

A LITTLE GIRL IN LAOS

The future of Laos is tied up with such little girls as this one adorning our cover. A Catholic in Vientiane, she is one of every four children born in Laos that live through early childhood. For Laos is not a "developing nation." It is not even underdeveloped. It is undeveloped. It lacks even one trained dentist and one veterinary. There are lots of economists, but that is part of the evil genius of American aid.

Laos is the most primitive nation in Asia, if you can call it a nation. Laos and Cambodia were set up arbitrarily as administrative units by the French. It is a large country, but most of it is empty. There are just 2 million people. Half of the territory is occupied by North Vietnamese Communists.

America talked other nations into giving up the defense of Laos in 1962. There were all kinds of reasons, e.g., it was landlocked; Ho Chi Minh would pull out if we did; it was the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time, and so forth. Reasons, excuses, and lots of wishful thinking.

If ever the domino theory taught us a costly lesson, it was Laos. We and a number of other SEATO nations were fighting there, containing North Vietnam with a minimum of effort. We had only 12,000 troops, all advisers.

The late President in Saigon, Ngo Dinh Diem, wanted to keep troops in Laos to prevent them from coming down into South Vietnam. But President Kennedy vetoed the idea. Instead he got an agreement with Hanoi to pull out its troops if we pulled out ours. We took Hanoi at its word and pulled out our troops. Averell Harriman toured the United States for 2½ months, exclaiming: "We are going to have peace in Southeast Asia." Why? Because Hanoi had not only promised but signed!

South Vietnamese often warn Americans that the war will not be over if we just pull out. It will shift to another country and continue. That precisely is the lesson of Laos. By pulling out of Laos we enabled Hanoi to fight a bigger war in South Vietnam.

People who want to get out of Vietnam now, without forcing the enemy back to the North, are looking for peace at any price. But that is what encourages aggressors and

leads to other wars. Without giving up Laos, the enemy could never have provoked a big war in South Vietnam. The border from North Vietnam to South is only 51 miles wide and could be effectively patrolled. But in giving up Laos we gave Hanoi a 400-mile border for entering South Vietnam.

Half of Laos is still free, the half the enemy doesn't need. Meanwhile, U.S. AID is pouring \$250 per person annually into Laos, a record \$500 million a year. We are bogged down in Southeast Asia, victims of our own indecision. The war will go on until we act decisively. The Cambodian operation is the first hopeful sign. Vietnamization can work, if we change our self-imposed rules. Herebefore we have gone about it wrong.

WOODROW WILSON SCHOLARS EX-EMPLIFY TODAY'S YOUTH; TEXAS NO. 1 IN THE NATION

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, our educational system in the United States today faces great turmoil as has been shown by the events of recent months on our college and university campuses. In the face of these trying times, it is heartwarming to read of the national accomplishments achieved by many of our students despite these trying times.

An outstanding example of the great accomplishments made by today's students in the State of Texas is their being named Woodrow Wilson Designates for 1970. Forty-two such students were named from my great State, and an additional 1,111 from across the Nation.

I am especially pleased that 100 students were selected for special study awards by the foundation and, of the 100 students selected, four attended universities within the University of Texas system. My alma mater, the University of Texas, led the Nation in the number of students receiving the special study awards.

An article in the Texas Times, a publication of the University of Texas system, for April-May 1970, describes the four top students and their aspirations, and I ask unanimous consent to have this article entitled "University of Texas System Leads the Nation" printed in the Extensions of Remarks today. In addition I respectfully request that the names of the additional Woodrow Wilson scholars from Texas be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article and names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Texas Times, April-May 1970]
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SYSTEM LEADS NATION
The University of Texas System led the nation with four winners of Independent Study Awards from the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.

Three UT Austin students and one at UT El Paso were recipients of the \$1,000 awards, the first of their kind ever given by the foundation.

Only 100 top seniors in U.S. and Canadian colleges and universities were selected for

the awards. They were among the 1,153 Woodrow Wilson Designates named earlier this year.

FOR SUMMER WORK

Winners at UT Austin are John T. Pitts, Erin Christine Raschke and John Henry Zammito. The UT El Paso winner is Michael D. Miner.

They will use their awards for approved projects of study, research or travel this summer or next.

Miner plans to use his \$1,000 during the summer of 1971 to travel to Athens, Greece, to do translations of modern Greek poetry. He is an English major. Miner's wife, Anna, is a native of Greece who came to the U.S. about five years ago to attend college. She is a January 1970 graduate of UT El Paso.

Pitts intends to use his Independent Study Award in Austin this summer, working in three major areas. He will study mathematics, specifically analysis and algebraic topology; continue his study of Russian and review his work in German, preparatory to taking the language exams at Princeton, where he will work toward a Ph.D. degree; pursue "fairly extensive" reading in the history and philosophy of science.

SERIES OF ESSAYS

Zammito will devote the summer to writing a series of essays in social theory, working primarily in Austin but also traveling a bit. He spent his junior year in the International Honors Program, traveling to Japan, India and Europe in a group of 32 students. They studied social modernization and wrote essays on the various countries and topics studied.

Miss Raschke will postpone implementation of her Independent Study Award until the summer of 1971. She probably will do research in biochemistry at the graduate school she will attend for the Ph.D. She has not yet made that decision.

WOODROW WILSON DESIGNATES—1970-71

TEXAS

[Name and undergraduate college]

Austin

Helfert, Michael Robert, University of Texas, Austin.

Pitts, Jon T., University of Texas, Austin.

Raschke, Erin Christine, University of Texas, Austin.

Seitz, William Alfred, Rice University.

Waide, Jack Boid, University of Texas, Austin.

Baytown

Howell, Elsie, University of Arkansas.

Swofford, Raymond Pierce III, Rice University.

Caldwell

Moore, Linda Ruth, University of Texas, Austin.

Corpus Christi

Booker, Diane Christine, Rice University.

Caldwell, Christine, Newcomb Coll. Tulane U.

Coleman, Paulette, Bensalem Coll. Fordham U.

Dallas

Daugherty, Gregory Neil, University of Richmond.

Grotevant, Harold Dennis, University of Texas, Austin.

Kaufman, Kay Louise, University of Michigan.

Sweet, Melvin Allen, Southern Methodist U.

Deer Park

Wheat, Ira David, Jr., Texas Technological U.

Denton

Hudson, Mrs. Ann Rylander, North Texas State U.

Logue, John Alan, University of Texas, Austin.

El Paso

Miner, Michael David, University of Texas, El Paso.

Fairfield

Ritter, Jack L., University of Houston.

Fort Worth

Sayre, Sandra Mitchell, College of Wooster.

Spurlock, Janis Leigh, Texas Christian U.

Galveston

Jameson, Elizabeth Ann, Antioch College.

Houston

Birkman, Sharon Lea, Columbia University.

Collins, Lee Anthony, Rice University.

Danziger, Sheldon H., Columbia University.

Frank, Steven I., University of Texas, Austin.

Kaplan, Mrs. Bari Watkins, Rice University.

Kaplan, Barry Alan, Rice University.

Martin, Daniel Wayne, University of Houston.

Irving

Cowan, Mr. Bainard, University of Dallas.

La Marque

Droullhet, Sidney James II, Rice University.

Laredo

Zammito, John Henry, University of Texas, Austin.

Lovelady

Williams, Linda Faye, Rice University.

Monahans

Booth, John Allen, Rice University.

Nacogdoches

Blackmon, Wilbur Dee, Jr., University of Arkansas.

San Antonio

Zaumeier, Gay Esther, Southwestern University.

de Leon, Irma, Incarnate Word College.

Keynon, Gary A., University of Texas, Austin.

Teague

Cox, Jeffrey Lee, Rice University.

Vernon

Munn, Miss Hanaba, Harding College.

Waco

Brown, Leo Dale, Baylor University.

OPPOSITION TO ANY PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE COAL AND OTHER FOS-SIL FUELS UNDER THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent article in the New York Times, the administration is reported to be considering the transfer of all the atomic weapons program for the Atomic Energy Commission to the Department of Defense. In addition, all matters relating to energy would be placed under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission. President W. A. Boyle of the United Mine Workers of America has protested the inclusion of coal within the framework of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is that the pronuclear bias of the Atomic Energy Commission would result in a complete deemphasis of coal as an

energy source. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, because of the record of the Atomic Energy Commission as an opponent of nonnuclear power, it must give reasonable men deep concern when considering the suggestion that the Atomic Energy Commission, as currently structured, should now become the Nation's energy agency. In any event, I believe Mr. Boyle's comments are worthy of note and am inserting them in the RECORD for the information of the Members of Congress:

OPPOSITION TO ANY PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE COAL AND OTHER FOSSIL FUELS UNDER THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The United Mine Workers of America today expressed complete opposition to any attempt to restructure the Atomic Energy Commission that would place coal and other fossil fuels under the agency's jurisdiction.

The union's opposition followed press reports of the Nixon Administration's intentions to turn the AEC into an agency concerned only with so-called peaceful uses of atomic energy and to give the new agency jurisdiction over other fuels. The UMW has long advocated the need for a unified energy policy which would meet America's power needs. The AEC, as presently constituted, is certainly not the agency to formulate and implement such an energy policy.

"The AEC is dedicated to the ascendancy of atomic fuels over all other forms of energy, and is the deadly enemy of coal. Any transfer of coal into its jurisdiction will almost certainly result in the subordination of coal and coal research, no matter what kind of cosmetic job is done upon the agency," W. A. (Tony) Boyle, UMW president said.

Boyle added that the welfare of 200,000 members of his union, working and retired, is closely bound up with a rational national fuels policy. He added there is no such thing as a "peaceful atom" and warned that "promiscuous use" of this source of energy as sought by the AEC endangers the future of humanity.

"Only a few days ago, two AEC scientists warned that the energy is endangering the future of the human race with its frenetic attempt to foist atomic energy upon this nation. These scientists have estimated that there will be at least 32,000 extra deaths from cancer this year as a result of AEC approved standards for radiation from the 'peaceful' uses of atomic energy.

"Radiation represents only one aspect of the danger. Waste generated by the use of radioactive materials in the core of atomic power plants presents an even more gruesome threat. These atomic wastes are boiled down, sealed in steel drums and buried. These drums decay and must be dug up so that wastes may be transferred and reburied at least once every 15 years. There is grave danger of leakage of these highly radioactive wastes which, in some cases, will remain deadly poisonous to man and beast for thousands of years.

"There is no safe place to bury radioactive atomic wastes on land or in the seas and we are fast running out of land sites that the AEC calls safe. The National Science Foundation has called present burial sites poor geologic locations and there is no question that atomic waste burial is a major threat in the event of earthquakes or other geologic slippage.

"The AEC is playing Russian roulette with the lives and health of the American people and there is no justification, economic or social, for its present policies. This nation is blessed with a plentiful supply of fossil fuels which can be used safely and economically. Environmental problems resulting from the use of fossil fuels can be overcome through publicly supported research and the adoption of effective national standards for extraction," Boyle said.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN C. VILLAUME

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of next week Dr. John C. Villaume will retire as the president of the International Correspondence Schools, Scranton, Pa.

I doubt that any Member of this body has not heard of ICS which for many years has been the outstanding correspondence school in the whole world. Many Members of this body have studied the courses from ICS. Almost 10 percent of the presidents and board chairmen of American corporations can likewise claim ICS as their alma mater. It is a distinguished educational institution; and during the tenure of Dr. Villaume as its president, it achieved new distinctions. The seventh and eighth millionth students were enrolled at ICS under his presidency, and it is well on the way to enrolling its ninth millionth student.

Dr. Villaume is a graduate of Gettysburg College and holds a master's degree from Duke University as well as an honorary doctor of laws from the University of Scranton in Pennsylvania. He served during the Second World War in the Adjutant General's department; and was separated from service with the rank of captain.

He joined the staff of ICS shortly after his separation from service where he rose rapidly from the position of assistant director of the high school department to the presidency in 1959.

Since 1960 he has served, likewise, as a director of the International Textbook Corp., and of the International Correspondence Schools World Limited.

Dr. Villaume is a member of innumerable distinguished educational and management associations, as well as the author of several important texts in the field of personnel and management. He has lectured before learned audiences both here and abroad.

In choosing to retire at the early age of 54, Dr. Villaume is by no means looking forward to a sedentary life. His career as a lecturer will continue, and he will bring his countless talents now to the challenging field of university teaching at a time when there is a profound need for men of his quality in this field.

I know that all of my colleagues will join me in wishing Dr. Villaume well in his retirement. In a lifetime, he has served America well. He was a distinguished soldier in time of war; more significantly, he has been a distinguished servant of the people in time of peace, enriching the lives of countless Americans through his work at ICS.

I extend my own personal good wishes to John, both as a friend and as one who has seen the work he has done in our own community, to make that community a better place in which to live. I look forward with delight and anticipation to the work he will do in a new

career. I am certain it will be as distinguished as the work he has done in the past.

MORE QUESTIONS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have said before that Mrs. Margery Burns, a farm housewife, is one of my favorite newspaper columnists. She writes for a number of our Minnesota rural newspapers with a professional's knowledge and perception.

With your permission, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time Mrs. Burns' latest column, "More Questions."

I most emphatically recommend the reading of this column to my colleagues.

MORE QUESTIONS

It's hard for all of us to think about anything else these days except the war in Vietnam and the campus protests against that war. I don't believe anyone in the whole country is "for" the war in Vietnam. Or for any war. And a successful plan to get us out of Vietnam and end that war should be terrific news for all of us.

None of us can blame the students for protesting this endless war. Or any war. However, most of us don't go for senseless, violent protests by students and non-students because those are the same thing as the senseless violence of any war.

And there are some questions which keep coming up now concerning this whole problem of Vietnam. Maybe the protesters can answer them. Maybe you can answer them. Or maybe they'll raise even more questions.

For instance, with all the protests aimed at our getting out of Cambodia, why aren't the same protests aimed at North Vietnam getting out of there too? Why protest half the problem? Or is it all right for North Vietnam to invade a neutral country? Why don't students protest the treatment which our men are receiving as prisoners of North Vietnam? Why can't all those protests be aimed at the whole war over there? Wouldn't that kind of protest give Hanoi a real jolt?

All the protests from students, faculty and politicians concerning our being in Vietnam brings up the question of our helping Israel. The politicians seem willing to heat up the situation in Israel at the same time they are taking action against the situation in Vietnam. Wouldn't it be consistent if we pulled our help out of Vietnam, Israel, Europe, Korea and all the other countries where we have troops and arms? Or is it more moral for us to get involved in some countries than it is in others? And who decides?

Our Senators are going to pass laws now against expanding our military role in Vietnam, but why didn't they do this eight years ago? I think we can give the students credit for forcing more public awareness about these terrible problems. It's tragic that the students and other young people had to take it on the chin for these last eight years while the government pushed us into dangerous spots all over the world. Or should all of us, including the students, be even more concerned about the people in other countries? Where do we draw the line?

I hope the students will broaden their protests to include these questions. Our country needs their help. Our country has always needed help from all the people. And most of our young people should be smart enough to know the difference between help and hindrance.

THIRTY YEARS OF SLAVERY FOR
THE BALTIC STATES

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, June 15, 1940, witnessed the tragic invasion of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviets and the resulting loss of independence and freedom for the Baltic States. It has been 30 years since the Soviet occupation of these States.

The sad and brutal events of the Soviet occupation of June 1940 constituted genocide and more than one-fourth of the entire population of these three States have been lost. Since the occupation, the Soviets have continued the policy of genocide and oppression of the people of the Baltic States. More than 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters have lost their lives in open resistance to the invading Soviets.

While the United States has refused to recognize the seizures of June 1940 and has maintained diplomatic relations with the former free governments, there is a need for additional action to bring the full force of world opinion to bear on this tragic example of oppression of a free people. The course of action recommended by the Congress is set forth in the language of House Concurrent Resolution 416, passed by the House of Representatives on June 21, 1965, by a record vote of 298 yeas to no yeas and unanimously adopted by the Senate on October 22, 1966. I am placing the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416 in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues and in the hope that the President of the United States will carry out the steps recommended by Congress in this measure:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

TOWARD HUMAN SOLIDARITY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting several weeks ago the National Conference of Catholic Bishops drafted a far-reaching statement in observance of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. I am pleased to place it in the RECORD.

In so doing, I recommend the reading of it and the consideration of its several suggestions and proposals to every Member of this body for it has great significance for the United States and the world in its entirety.

The statement follows:

TOWARD HUMAN SOLIDARITY

(Statement on the 25th anniversary of the United Nations by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops)

Twenty-five years ago this month, while World War II was still an agonizing reality, representatives of 51 nations gathered in San Francisco. In the name of "the Peoples of the United Nations", "they pledged to unite their strength within a comprehensive new juridical and political world organization" to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war in accordance with principles of justice and international law.

The American Bishops declared a few months later that our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. Concerned that the great powers were placed in a position "above the law" in matters relating to the maintenance of peace and security, they expressed the hope that a sound institution would develop from the recognition of the rights and duties of international society.

As the American Bishops meet now in 1970 in San Francisco, a city which bears the name of the patron of peace, we deem it appropriate to welcome the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the United Nations.

Even more important, however, this is a fitting occasion for an examination of conscience and a renewed resolve to unite, as both the Gospel and the times demand, to banish war and to make of the earth a peaceable kingdom.

We call upon American Catholics to join with us in appreciation of the noble purposes of the United Nations and of its innovative efforts and achievements in behalf of human solidarity, human development and peace, and we urge them to increase their knowledge and understanding of these efforts and achievements.

At the same time we recognize, as the United Nations itself is doing, how far it still is from meeting contemporary threats to and demands for that peace, justice and true

human progress which are the theme of the anniversary year.

Common endeavors of the Member States of the United Nations, harmonizing national interests, have indeed deepened and broadened awareness of the reciprocal rights and obligations of states in international life. Some conflicts have been averted, contained or halted by its efforts.

The horrendous character of nuclear, chemical and biological warfare has been universally acknowledged, and treaties to limit or abolish the respective weapons have been concluded or initiated.

Numerous new states, formerly under colonial rule, have been assisted in the transition to independence and the new responsibilities thereof, and they have been welcomed to United Nations membership on terms of juridical equality.

The dignity and fundamental equality of all members of the human family, without regard to sex, race, color, religion or any other distinction, have been repeatedly affirmed and enhanced through formal declarations and treaties, through various educational campaigns and through positive action of a social nature.

Worldwide technical cooperation and other forms of mutual assistance are feeding the hungry, healing the sick, instructing the ignorant and sheltering the homeless.

A body of international law to cover existing and expanding relations in international life, which otherwise might lead to conflict, is being progressively developed.

Agreements to preserve outer space, the ocean bed and an uncontaminated environment as the peaceful patrimony of all mankind have been concluded or are in the making.

There can be no doubt that the United Nations could move to that higher dimension of community and authority demanded by the contemporary crises of peoples, which are, in fact, world crises, if men and states would take seriously the injunction of Pope Paul to the United Nations: "We must get used to thinking of man in a new way, of men's life in common in a new way, in a new way, too, of the paths of history and the destiny of the world."

In a world made one by the evolution of communications and transportation, this new way requires States to emerge from the anachronistic structures which enshrine old concepts of unlimited national sovereignty.

As Christians and as American citizens, we have a special responsibility to cherish and protect the life of men in community and to assist the United Nations to help us do so. As Americans we must acknowledge the reality of our massive power and take the lead in sharing it, strengthening the world organization.

This calls for acceleration in the delicate exchange in which the United States and other nations experience a limitation of the power to act unilaterally and an expansion of the obligation to share the responsibility of global peace and development.

This limitation of unilateral power occurs notably in the area of arms control which can effectively curb the power of any State to make war and the concomitant establishment of a UN peacekeeping system capable of speedy action to guarantee security. The success of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Between the United States and the USSR is a first and necessary step.

As to possibilities of peace-keeping, without which there will be no real or lasting arms control, in the words of Charles Yost, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations: "We have only to glance at some of the key provisions of the Charter to see how far we have fallen short of making them living realities, how substantially we have failed to develop the institution and the sort of international society which the authors of

the Charter had in mind. . . . The United Nations is still waiting for its members to give it the authority to settle disputes and to live up to its promises of peace."

The United States should not only take the lead in the new efforts to institutionalize a standby UN peacekeeping force and to set up fact finding, arbitration, mediation and conciliation mechanisms for settling political disputes, it should also take bold steps to substitute for the rule of force a rule of law. In the light of changed world conditions we encourage and shall promote wide public discussion of greater use by the United States of the long established but practically unemployed International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes.

The compelling needs of mankind no less than the growing dangers to peace are an indictment of the untrammelled pursuit of national self-interest. There is evidence that our great country and its generous people, hold not the first but the eleventh place among the nations in percentage of our gross national product allotted to help in the development of poorer nations and peoples.

We welcome the new directions, outlined by the President's Task Force on International Development, which call for the reversal of the downward trend of such contributions and for greater use of international rather than national channels in distributing such aid. Only in this way can we share effectively in the promotion of global solidarity and increase the common stake of all nations in a strengthened United Nations.

Sympathetic exploration in the United Nations of an International Volunteer Corps should be given every encouragement.

The patterns and practices of international trade in which we are engaged also call for a serious assessment in light of the present needs and the future well-being of the world. Our country should provide a far more adequate response to those nations which suffer from the injustices of the present system in which we play a powerful role, the structures which support these injustices must be examined with a view to change.

All of our strivings for true human progress will be frustrated if we cannot honestly regard each of our brothers as another self, whose true vocation, like ours, is to love and to seek and embrace the good and the true, and thus attain that higher level of life which is his destiny. This regard must be expressed also in laws and institutions.

Of the many Conventions drafted since 1945 by the United Nations with the object of securing reciprocal commitment by all nations to protect and promote particular human rights, the United States has ratified but one.

We urge again, as we did in 1968, U.S. ratification of the Convention on Genocide and pledge ourselves to assist in the promotion of wide public dialogue, not only on these Conventions which have already been submitted to Congress, e.g. on forced labor and women's political rights, but also on others which should be so submitted, including those on racial discrimination and discrimination in education.

In any global approach to the problems of peace and human welfare, the real and potential magnitude of the Peoples Republic of China cannot be ignored. We commend the present Administration for continuing the efforts to develop workable relationship with the people of mainland China and encourage wide public discussion of this subject.

Informed and conscientious participation in forming national policies is the surest way to promote change looking to greater international cooperation. The exercise of this right and duty should be ensured by continuing education. We must ask ourselves

whether our schools, organizations and institutions are ministering to the formation of a global mentality or whether they are reinforcing outmoded nationalistic, and even chauvinistic, attitudes of the past.

In the development of a world public opinion, we would urge study of the possibilities inherent in the common interests and actions of the many international non-governmental organizations. Their experience is a contribution to the growth of world community and is so recognized in the consultative status granted to many of them by the UN Economic and Social Council.

In concluding, we recall the words of Pope Paul VI to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1965: "This Organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace . . . Go forward." The path is obligatory because the world can no longer afford the luxury of completely autonomous and self-sustaining nation states.

In the United Nations, therefore, we see the beginnings of a new international order to replace the jealous sovereignty of States and the fragmenting forces of nationalism—a new international order in which mutual cooperation and respect for rights and duties will lead to that human solidarity which may be said to reflect the plan of the Creator who made mankind one that they might seek Him.

50TH ANNIVERSARY TRANSCONTINENTAL AIRMAIL SERVICE

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was called to my attention that September 8, 1970, will mark the 50th anniversary of transcontinental airmail service in the United States.

The Silver Wings Fraternity, a national organization consisting of men and women aviators who have been flying more than 25 years, and among whose membership are several well-known public figures, plans to commemorate the occasion by flying between New York and San Francisco, making key stops inbetween. The fraternity is doing this entirely on its own, just as it did in 1960, to commemorate the 40th anniversary. At that time there were approximately 50 highly competent pilots who commanded new aircraft, and they were able to maintain better schedules than did the original pilots who flew the initial transcontinental flights. No air traffic problems were involved and the participants assumed full responsibility for their actions.

For the 50th anniversary, it is hoped these pilots will again be permitted to carry airmail, as they did in 1960, and transport it from one city to another. The Postmaster General now has under consideration the fraternity's official request for permission to carry airmail. Hopefully it will be approved. A reception is planned at each of the airports involved—postmasters and mayors are being invited to participate.

The plans described will commemorate a most significant milestone in our Na-

tion's history and I should like to commend this fine group of pilots for their genuine interest in formally recognizing the event. I salute the Silver Wings Fraternity for the important role its profession has played in providing airmail service for our citizens and for its significant contributions to the field of aviation as well.

SAD ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC PEOPLES

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the sad anniversary of the captivity of the Baltic peoples and their consequent loss of freedoms and loss of lives and great sufferings these brave people have had to and are going through.

Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia lost their freedom and independence when the Soviets invaded and occupied these three peace-loving countries on June 15, 1940. After the Soviet's troops moved into the Baltic republics, one of the most brutal occupations of all time began. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were dragged off to trains and jammed into cars without food or water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic or Siberia. The Baltic peoples have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation of their people in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

On June 21, 1965, a step in the right direction was taken. House Concurrent Resolution 416 was adopted by the House of Representatives by a record vote of 298 yeas to no nays, and unanimously passed by the U.S. Senate on October 22, 1966. The resolution states as follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United

States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it,

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

As a proud member of the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States, a nationwide organization, I encourage each of you to join in with me in urging President Nixon to implement this very important legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations.

FORT WORTH WELCOMES AMERICAN TRAINING CENTER

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate American Airlines on the dedication of its new Flight Academy and expanded Stewardess College in Fort Worth.

Located at Greater Southwest International Airport, these two schools make up the American Airlines Training Center, the largest and most advanced of its kind in the world. The center, dedicated yesterday is now open and ready for the challenging 1970's.

Particular congratulations rightfully go to three persons in the American Airlines family. The Honorable C. R. Smith was American's chief executive officer from 1934 to 1948 except for a period during World War II when, as a major general, he served as deputy commander of the U.S. Air Transport Command. He left the airline early in 1968 to serve as Secretary of Commerce under President Lyndon Johnson. In acknowledgment of Mr. Smith's contributions, the center is properly dedicated to him.

Further recognition goes to the multi-million-mile pilot, Capt. John H. Gibson, a vice president of American Airlines who will be managing the new Flight Academy, and to the lovely and distinguished Miss Millie Alford who will be directing the expanded Stewardess College. To Captain Gibson and Miss Alford and their staffs is entrusted the training of the pilots and stewardesses of the future.

While the original Stewardess College has been an outstanding member of the Fort Worth community for over a decade, I am proud to welcome the additions to

the American Airlines Training Center and I am confident of its continued success.

PRESIDENT OFFERS NOTHING NEW

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the President's economic report yesterday, I was struck by the failure of Mr. Nixon to realize the need for new approaches to the problems in our economy. He has once again merely asked the American people for more time for his patently ineffective policies to take effect.

The two most significant crises confronting our economy today are unemployment and inflation. The President yesterday refused to address himself to these issues in any but a very cavalier fashion. Regarding unemployment, Mr. Nixon merely observed that "the number of Americans who have jobs is the highest in our history." This, to my mind, glosses over the simple fact that the number of Americans unemployed today is climbing to tragic levels.

Responding to the rampant inflation which is daily attacking the purchasing power of the dollar, the President first implied that a form of "jawboning" would be utilized—the Council of Economic Advisors' "inflation alert"—then categorically denied the use of such tactics. This contradictory approach can only serve to confuse and dislocate conscientious efforts by the members of the U.S. economic structure to exercise that elusive entity, "social responsibility." By refusing to define what he meant by that terminology, the President has made way for a veritable Pandora's Box of definitions, all of which are vulnerable to Presidential disclaim and discredit. No union or manufacturer can feel any responsive restraint under this enigmatic formula.

I think the people of this country have had enough rhetoric and not enough reality. The President has plied Americans with platitudes instead of solutions.

My most recent newsletter to my constituents deals specifically and explicitly with the economic ills of this country and, even more importantly, with what must be done to cure these ills in a responsible and timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of that letter in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESSMAN RICHARD T. HANNA REPORTS TO YOU

DEAR FRIEND: Although the news about the Indochina war has taken the major headlines recently, it has not obscured the worsening economic situation we are facing. Perhaps the most dramatic indication of the serious state of our financial structure has been the precipitous fall in the stock market. The market has declined almost 300 points since the end of 1968.

While the stock market itself is not the best indicator of the nation's economic health, it does have a strong relationship to the confidence investors have in the

Administration's ability to deal with rising costs, unemployment, falling profits, and decreasing productivity. The economy of our local area has been particularly hurt.

These very specific problems are raising serious questions that are not being answered by the Administration. The point, of course, is that the present high interest, tight money policies of the Administration are causing more problems than they are solving. I believe it would be helpful if I review the present economic conditions and suggest alternatives to the present ineffective policies.

A RECESSION WITH INFLATION

The two things most Administration economists agreed could never happen, a recession with a high rate of inflation, are precisely the circumstances of our present situation. Let's take a look at some of the most recent economic indicators. They are anything but encouraging.

Unemployment nationally and in our area has been skyrocketing. The national adjusted rate of April is now 4.8%. The rate increase over March was the highest in 10 years. Earlier this year, the chief economic advisors to the President, Arthur Burns and Paul McCracken, both testified before my Committee that unemployment would probably not exceed 4.2%. Now they are saying 5%.

In our area, unemployment has risen by almost a third since March of 1969. At that time, the rate was about 4%. This past March, it had gone up to 5.3%, and we can expect, when the April figures are released, it will be much higher.

AEROSPACE AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY UNEMPLOYMENT

Two vital industries have been very seriously hit with unemployment. Both the local aerospace and construction industries have been confronted with serious slowdowns and layoffs. Local aerospace jobs have declined almost 22% since their peak in December of 1967. At the end of March, almost 30% of our area's construction workers were unemployed.

From the standpoint of our local community, the layoffs, particularly in aerospace, have been very harmful. Thousands of engineers and scientists who have been working in the industry for years are now finding themselves unemployable. There is a real danger that the important North American Rockwell airframe development team may break up, thereby causing a serious loss to our national technological program. Dwindling Administration support for our scientific and technological communities are undermining not only our industrial competitive strength, but also our effective ability to deal with the problems in our environment and our cities. The cost of putting this expertise back together again will be immense.

PRICES STILL GOING UP

Despite the serious unemployment picture caused by the deliberate economic policies of the Administration, there has been almost no success in controlling inflation.

The overall price index rose by 6% during the first quarter of 1970. The cost of living index is still racing at an adjusted pace of over 7% nationally, close to 8% in our area.

What does this mean to you? It means, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, that if your family income is \$10,000 a year you will pay \$800 more this year, than last, for the exact same goods and services.

One of the biggest factors in the dramatic rise in the cost of living has been excessively high interest rates. In another deliberate, and most ill advised, move this Administration sent interest rates soaring to historic highs. This move, rather than controlling inflation, has helped spur it as well as sending the entire home building and finance industries into one of its deepest depressions in history.

HIGH INTEREST RATES AND THE HOME BUYER

Our community has suffered inordinately from this high interest policy. As I mentioned earlier, high interest rates have caused a steady downturn in housing starts and have thrown thousands of local construction workers out of their jobs.

Growing families looking for new housing have found themselves having to pay more than one-third of their monthly incomes to meet the high mortgage payments.

Do you remember when you could get a 6½% mortgage on a new house? It wasn't that long ago. This time in 1968 you were able to get a conventional mortgage at around 6½%. Your monthly payments for principal and interest on a \$25,000 house, on a 30 year mortgage, ran you about \$156 in May of 1968. Today, just two years later, a mortgage on a \$25,000 house will cost 8½% plus points, and your monthly payment will be \$192 a month—\$36 more a month just to pay the interest. And of course, inflation will make that \$25,000 house in 1968 cost closer to \$30,000 today.

Not only have the high interest rates caused your mortgages to cost more but also your property taxes. Necessary local needs such as sewer facilities, school buildings, and roads are financed by bonds sold by our local cities. Municipal bonds, when they can be marketed, are going at all-time high interest rates. And you know who pays the bill for these high rates—the property tax payer.

FALLING PROFITS AND PRODUCTIVITY

The most serious indicators reflecting a deepening recession are, of course, declining profits and the faltering gross national product.

A survey just completed by First National City Bank of New York reports "A steady stream of disappointing corporate reports, which showed earnings even lower than expected in the first quarter, was one of the factors that helped plunge stock prices to the lowest level in over six years . . ."

The report goes on to say that "The sharp reduction in profits—over 9 per cent from a year earlier—confirms earlier indications of a developing recession."

On the serious condition of our gross national product, the Wall Street Journal reported ". . . physical output of private and government goods and services—decreased at a 3% annual rate in the first quarter. This is almost twice as rapid a falloff as the 1.6% rate reported earlier, and is the steepest slide in real output since the same rate in 1960, a recognized period of recession."

The Wall Street Journal summed up America's deteriorating economy by reporting that:

"Industrial production resumed its long decline in April after a fillip in March.

"Personal income in April would have fallen for the first time in almost five years, but was saved by a surge in Social Security checks.

"Corporate profits fell sharply in the first quarter to the lowest level since late 1967.

"Overall inflation in the first quarter was much worse than reported earlier, while real output fell twice as fast as estimated originally.

"The U.S. balance of payments plunged deeply back into deficit in the first quarter."

WHAT MUST BE DONE NOW!

As early as 1968 I demonstrated my concern over the economic warning signals that were evident even then. I introduced legislation at that time to assist home building and keep interest rates stable. During 1969 and this year I have taken the floor repeatedly, written the President time and again, and have met with the President's leading economic advisors on numerous occasions to protest current policies and offer alternatives. I have

co-authored six major pieces of legislation, one which has passed but has not been implemented by the President, and one which will soon pass. All of these bills, if implemented will lower interest rates, help curtail inflation, assist small businessmen, and save the homebuilding industry from complete collapse.

Strong measures are needed. Since 1969 I have advocated selective wage and price controls. A recent survey in our district suggests an overwhelming majority of the people favor such action. Even Mr. Burns, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, believes the President must now move in this direction.

One of the bills I co-authored and helped pass permits the President to implement selective credit controls. He has failed to take advantage of this tool and as a result market interest rates keep rising and money flows away from highly productive areas such as homebuilding. These controls must be implemented now!

The President must insist on and create policies that will channel money into more productive areas—activities that create jobs and a strong turnover in capital.

We can no longer be satisfied with the bland reassurances from the Administration that their economic policies are "on schedule." One high Administration official sarcastically commented, "Sure we're on schedule: we're ahead of schedule in getting to high unemployment, and we're behind schedule in reducing excessive inflation. Just average those two things out and you can see we're on schedule."

The present policies have proved bankrupt. Almost every indicator clearly reflects the danger our economy is in. The program outlined above is a constructive alternative to the present damaging policies.

In my next report, I will update the situation and report on the progress being made.

HOW INFLATION AFFECTS YOUR PAYCHECK

	Spring, 1968	Latest	Change
Weekly pay, typical worker	\$104.90	\$117.55	12.00
Federal taxes (income and Social Security)	11.60	14.45	2.85
"Inflation tax", reflecting 11.5 percent increase in living costs in past 2 years		10.63	10.63
What's left	93.30	92.47	-.83

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

¹ Up.
² Down.

A FATHER'S DAY TRIBUTE

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, a year ago a proud U.S. Marine wrote his last letter to his proud father. It was a Fathers Day greeting from Pfc. Daniel G. O'Connell, USMC, a dedicated young American, to Mr. Walter G. O'Connell, a loving father and distinguished educator, written on June 13, 1969. Daniel was killed in action in Vietnam 6 days later.

It is a short, simple letter, but its message is a moving, living tribute to the deep affection, the loyalty and warmth, mutual understanding and joy which is the base of the relationship of father to son and son to father. The letter follows:

JUNE 13, 1969.

DEAR DAD: This will be a little bit late, but I want you to know that I am thinking of you, and saying a special prayer for you, this Fathers Day. I hope that someday, I will be just as good in raising my children as you were in bringing up the six of us. God couldn't have given us a better Father.

You've given each one of us one or more of your unique traits, physically, mentally, and morally. We may not all have red hair, but we're all tall and handsome like you. We may not have been scholars in school, but we all have more brains and common sense than most to use outside of school where they are even more important. As far as morals go, we are all good Christians. We may not be angels all the time but we always try to do what's best in the eyes of God, and we do know right from wrong. My brothers and I know that we are better than the rest because our father is.

You have given us everything, Dad, and we will give you everything of ourselves in return. God Bless You on this very special Fathers Day, June 15, 1969.

Your proud and admiring son,

DANNY.

P.S.—Your Memorial Day address was the greatest yet, Dad.

BABE RUTH BASEBALL

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to Babe Ruth Baseball.

It is not often that the Halls of the Congress echo with as many glowing tributes for a national hero as has been spoken in support of the great Babe Ruth and the ideals for which he stood. In my opinion, no American has been better loved in our history than the immortal Babe who rose from the tragic shadows of an orphan's life to become the idol of a nation for generations.

Surely no greater tribute can be paid to any man than has been done for Babe Ruth in the organizing some 19 years ago of Babe Ruth Baseball which perpetuates his memory in the way which he would have loved best—the training of young men in the American traditions of sportsmanship, understanding of teamwork, and competitive spirit.

Through the efforts of the organization which bears his name, Babe Ruth has helped to prevent delinquency and to provide greater moral foundations through recreation for young Americans and their families. Many of the youngsters who are a part of Babe Ruth Baseball were born long after the famed "Sultan of Swat" thrilled the world with his 714th and last home run in 1935, yet they are the beneficiaries of his great humanitarianism.

I commend all of those who have given so much of their time and efforts toward the enrichment of the lives of so many youngsters by their support of Ruth Baseball.

INFLATION—ARTHUR A. SMITH

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, there are lots of Smith's in this country but there is only one Arthur A. Smith. He just wrote his final monthly newsletter on June 15 for the First National Bank. For 20 years we have all looked forward to Smith's salty, factual analysis of business and finance that comes out the first of each month.

Arthur Smith is an old friend of mine. For many years he was an economics professor at Southern Methodist University where the conservative economic principles he taught are being actively followed by successful alumni all over America.

Then he moved downtown to our nationally recognized First National Bank in Dallas. He became not only the economist but is now the senior vice president.

Read the solid analysis of inflation. It has ideas that speak plainly to us in Congress. This is Arthur Smith's final letter and it is a great one.

The newsletter follows:

NEWSLETTER BY ARTHUR A. SMITH

The Administration has asked Congress to raise the legal limit of the Federal debt by \$18 billion to a record high of \$395 billion. This is discouraging after a build-up of hope that Uncle Sam's finances would be subjected to greater discipline. It anticipates more budget deficits.

The statutory debt limit has been raised so many times that the word "limit" has lost its conventional meaning.

The debt limitation takes two forms: (1) permanent and (2) temporary. Be assured that the "permanent" isn't permanent! At present the limitation is a temporary one at \$377 billion until June 30, 1970, when it reverts to the present "permanent" limit of \$365 billion; then on June 30, 1971, the latter goes up to \$380 billion. Now the Administration asks for a temporary increase of \$18 billion from the present temporary limit of \$377 billion because the amount presently outstanding subject to debt limitation is already close to \$377 billion. You figure out the prospects of bringing this back to \$365 billion in two weeks—dim prospects, for sure! You can bet that come June 30, 1971, the then "permanent" ceiling of \$380 billion will not suffice either. Why do intelligent adults create such a diabolical delusion? Who is kidding whom?

After at least nine of the most prosperous years in our history (prosperous in the sense of highest economic level), you might wonder why the Federal Government was not able to reduce its indebtedness. Or you might ask: "If Uncle Sam cannot keep his fiscal house in order in the best of economic times, when will he ever do so?" Basically the answer is that there has been no real intention to control the debt—no serious thought of ever paying it off, or even reducing it very much.

On the contrary, the kind of fiscal policy deliberately followed since 1961 utilized deficit financing as a major stimulant to advance the economy—a policy not even suspended, let alone abandoned, when the Viet Nam war accelerated. And unlike the World War II period when about 60% of the military costs were financed on credit, we have

not employed direct controls of any kind (wage, price, production, or rationing controls).

The above prodigal fiscal policy (the brain-child of the New Economists) has been almost entirely responsible for inflation—so much inflation in fact that the Government itself is now caught in its own trap since it must pay high prices for what it buys, the same as you and I, and must pay high interest on borrowed money—on the vast amount of refinanced debt constantly being rolled over as well as on new debt created by failure to balance the budget.

The following table shows how much the Federal interest-bearing debt has grown and how interest costs have mounted just since 1961:

End of fiscal year or month	Total interest-bearing public debt (billions)	Computed annual interest (billions)	Computed annual interest rate (percent)	Average maturity of the debt (months)
1961.....	\$286	\$8.8	3.072	54
1962.....	294	9.5	3.239	59
1963.....	302	10.1	3.360	61
1964.....	307	10.9	3.560	60
1965.....	313	11.5	3.678	64
1966.....	315	12.5	3.988	59
1967.....	322	13.0	4.039	55
1968.....	344	15.4	4.499	50
1969.....	352	17.1	4.891	48
1970 Mar.....	370	20.2	5.503	42

Source: Treasury Bulletin, April, 1970, pp. 23, 24.

It is not difficult to understand why political leaders of both major parties fell for such bad financial policy. Deficit financing was easier than raising enough taxes to cover bigger and bigger spending programs. Furthermore, the policy met with popular favor, even from industrial and financial leaders who should have known better. Surely they must have been sufficiently knowledgeable of history to realize that it would lead to serious economic trouble in time. Maybe they just did not care!

At any rate, the interest-bearing Federal debt increased \$84.3 billion from June 30, 1961, to March 31, 1970. This was \$84.3 billion that taxpayers did not have to pay, so to the unwary it might have seemed like a good thing, but since the whole process was inflationary (prices going up 28% in the period), inflation has eaten up far more than \$84.3 billion and left us with a headache we are likely to have for a long time. And don't overlook the fact that annual interest costs on total debt increased from \$8.8 billion on June 30, 1961, to \$20.2 billion on March 31, 1970. It was a bad deal any way you look at it.

It was more especially a bad deal for the low- and middle-income classes since inflation hurts them far out of proportion to the amount of taxes they would have paid under balanced budgets. In other words, inflation has cost them much much more than their share of the taxes that would have been required under balanced budgets. Yet some of the principal perpetrators of the Great Society posed as friends of the little man, and now under a government whose Congress is Democratic and whose Administration is Republican, the chances of a different policy still seem remote. Few, if any, political leaders on either side care to impose the fiscal discipline essential to the restoration of confidence in the dollar's stability. Little wonder that so many people here and abroad adamantly refuse to believe inflation in the United States will be stopped any time in the foreseeable future.

A prominent St. Paul, Minnesota, attorney, surely well grounded in economics, wrote me at length recently pointing out that "a workable solution of our economic and social

problems is frustrated by mixing with it a predominant factor of political expediency." And this is true. We see on every hand decisions that are motivated by political considerations primarily and by economic considerations only secondarily. A good example is the Federal budget. Despite all the fanfare in January about an anti-inflation budget for fiscal 1971, the budget as finally adopted was the highest in our history, calling for record spending. With its thoughts on this fall's Congressional election and on the Presidential election of 1972, Washington simply will not cut spending.

My correspondent in St. Paul is inclined to place much of the blame on the electorate who, after all, cannot escape responsibility in a representative democracy. He says: "The fact is the general mood of the public is to let inflation run, notwithstanding displeasure with mounting labor and commodity costs. The mood is reflected in Congressional actions which expand governmental outlays in almost every area of our social and economic affairs. We see the passage of a Welfare Bill, with a guaranteed annual wage, by an overwhelming vote of the House. Passage of the 1969 Tax Act did nothing to dampen the expectation of further inflation. We notice the relaxation of monetary and fiscal restraints by the Administration. The Federal Reserve Board reduces the marginal requirements for corporate stocks, a stimulation to speculation."

Most sobering is the reader's statement: "There is an undercurrent running in the lives of many today which is responsible for our economic predicament. It is propensity to get paid without furnishing a service—to enjoy prosperity without productive effort. There is growing unwillingness to recognize duties and the necessity of paying and serving for the privilege of living in an organized society. The economic and social virtue of prospering by one's own efforts seems outmoded. Instead there is a growing propensity to resort to legal plunder of property owners by political and governmental means—Inflation is one of the insidious methods of taxation to bring this about."

This is frightening, and all the more so because there appears to be no satisfactory, workable means of stopping a trend that can only destroy the system (political and economic) under which America rose to greatness. Private capitalism has not failed. Competitive free enterprise is not inherently evil. Under no form of government yet devised does the individual have greater liberty than under the democratic form. Yet with each passing generation there has been less appreciation of these institutions and an increasing inclination on the part of many individuals to blame the system for their own failures. Some people even would destroy the system without a single thought of an alternative.

Sometimes when I feel most depressed by our shortcomings, I take renewed hope by asking myself where I would go if I left the United States—or under what other system would I prefer to live. Maybe we should ask ourselves how many people elsewhere in the world would migrate to this country if we removed all immigration restrictions and if the people were free to leave where they are!

Finally, we can take greatest consolation, I believe, from America's history. Our country has had her share of crises before; and despite prophets of doom who predicted the nation would not survive, she, like Phoenix, the miraculous bird in Egyptian religion, fabled to live for 500 years, to be consumed in fire by its own ashes, only to rise in youthful freshness and vigor from its own ashes, will endure and emerge greater. Someone, I have forgotten who, said that "democracy is like a raft upon rough seas—we always have our feet wet, but we don't sink."

EXPANDING POWER CAPACITY IN
NEW ENGLAND, 1967-68

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the magnitude of the effort that the electric companies of New England are making to increase the electric power generating capacity of our region.

Since the year 1966, the electric companies of New England have ordered, installed, or placed under construction a total of 21 new plants or units, ranging from 340,000 to 1 million kilowatts in generating capacity, together representing a total of 12 million kilowatts of new power capacity for our region. The names, locations, capacity, and year of scheduled operation of each of these 21 new plants or units are as follows:

Year	State and location	Kilowatt
1967	Massachusetts: New Boston No. 2.....	400,000
1968	Connecticut:	
	Connecticut Yankee.....	575,000
	Bridgeport Harbor.....	390,000
1968	New Hampshire: Merrimac.....	340,000
1968	Massachusetts:	
	Canal No. 1.....	560,000
1969	Brayton Point No. 3.....	625,000
1970	Connecticut: Millstone Point No. 1.....	650,000
1971	Vermont: Vermont Yankee.....	540,000
1971	Massachusetts:	
	Pilgrim.....	650,000
1971	Northfield Mountain.....	1,000,000
1971	Montville.....	400,000
1972	Maine: Maine Yankee.....	855,000
1972	Massachusetts:	
	Salem Harbor.....	465,000
1973	Brayton Point No. 4.....	450,000
	Connecticut:	
1974	Millstone Point No. 2.....	830,000
1974	Undetermined location.....	400,000
1974	Massachusetts: Bear Swamp.....	600,000
1974	New Hampshire: Undetermined location.....	500,000
1975	Vermont: Vermont.....	400,000
1975	Massachusetts: Canal No. 2.....	560,000
1976	Connecticut: Southwest Connecticut.....	800,000

I should add that each of these new installations is or will be interconnected, one with the others, and with each of the other major power supply areas of the Northeast, by a new, high capacity extra-high-voltage transmission grid. Operations are being coordinated from a single, new central dispatching center in New England. The lower cost is being made available to all consumers in New England.

Mr. Speaker, this effort is both noteworthy and commendable. It should result in meaningfully lower rates for the consuming public.

ECONOMIC STABILITY IS NEAR

HON. WILEY MAYNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that people are becoming impatient about inflation.

This is natural and to be expected. They want prompt results.

I would point out to such persons that

while we are not yet out of the inflation woods, that, thanks to the Nixon administration's attack on the core of the problem, results are beginning to show.

Significant steps have been taken to cool the overheated economy. For one, fiscal policy and monetary policy are now in step, with the Federal Reserve System permitting only a slow rate of expansion in the money supply. The administration is working closely with the Federal Reserve toward the objective of cooling inflation. Moreover, economic indicators are turning. The weight of evidence suggests the current decline will not extend much beyond the midpoint of the year. Some of the factors sustaining this view include an advance of outlays by State and local governments; a slight revival in residential construction; and increase of consumer spending for some goods and services.

While there is no easy or painless way to achieve economic stability, we are making progress. Economic stability is nearer than most people are now willing to acknowledge.

THE CHALLENGE TO CHANGE

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend and colleague, DON H. CLAUSEN of California, delivered the commencement address to a high school graduating class in his congressional district. I have read the gentleman's remarks with great interest and believe they spell out a viable and meaningful challenge to the young people of our Nation.

In my judgment, Mr. CLAUSEN's excellent address merits the attention and consideration of everyone genuinely concerned about young America during the "decade of the 1970's," and it is for this reason that I am taking this opportunity to insert the full text of the gentleman's remarks in the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DON H. CLAUSEN

It is indeed a pleasure and an honor for me to address the Arcata High School graduating class of 1970.

I know you are glad for the occasion and so are we. Down deep you want to get that paraphernalia off and get a crack at life. It goes without saying that the world needs you. This is a time of change and the "Decade of the 70's" is "The Challenge of Change"—greater now than at any time in modern American history. There are many changes to be made and you are the ones to make them.

Like many generations before you, there is a natural and burning desire to make the world a better and safer place in which to live. This is commendable and to your great credit, for, if it did not exist within you, the world would surely be doomed.

During your high school years, you no doubt have come to realize one of the strangest of all human traits—I speak of man's inherent resistance and reluctance to change. Unfortunately, there are those in every society who are inclined to oppose any

major changes, feeling it is a repudiation of the past. There are those who resist the "winds of change" feeling that "this too shall pass" and all will be calm again. Undoubtedly, you have heard those who say forthrightly: "There's nothing wrong with young people today that ten years, a family, a mortgage, and car payments won't cure."

Those who maintain this kind of "totally negative" attitude about young people today, have somehow failed to note the fact that times are changing. They fail to realize or consider that a high school valedictorian of 1938, would have trouble with passing the entrance exams at any modern college or university, today. And, one thing you should remember now is that much of the information that was current when you arrived at Arcata High School four years ago, is now comparatively obsolete!

You, after all, are the beneficiaries of an on-going scientific, technological and communications revolution. This generation is really "tuned in". The average pre-school child today is being exposed to about 4,000 hours of television. While each of you received approximately 12,000 hours of classroom exposure at Arcata High School, you were also subjected to about 15,000 hours of TV exposure during the same period. Within the confines of your living rooms, you have experienced on-the-spot combat in Vietnam, campus riots, assassination of political leaders, civil rights and peace demonstrations, the wide, wide world of sports, and man's first walk on the moon.

All I'm really saying is, that, conventional educational institutions do not have a monopoly on education or dispensing information. Students today are getting greater exposure to life as it really is—than ever before in history.

In recent years it has been popular in some circles to blame your parents and grandparents for all the ills of society—to blame them for the failures and to criticize them for the shortcomings.

Not long ago an educator from Northwestern University got together some facts about these two generations—your parents and grandparents—that I would like to share with you.

Within just five decades, from 1919-1969, these people have, by their toll increased your life expectancy by approximately 50%, while cutting the average work day by one third.

These are the people who have given you a far healthier world than they found. TB is now almost unheard of, dreaded polio is no longer a medical mystery, and we no longer have to fear wide-spread epidemics of flu, typhus, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, measles or mumps.

Because of the vast improvements in food and nutritional technology, you are the tallest, healthiest, brightest, and probably the best looking generation to inhabit the land.

These are the people who fought man's grisliest war. They defeated the tyranny of Hitler and who, when it was over, had the compassion to spend billions of their tax dollars to help their former enemies rebuild their homelands.

They built literally thousands of new schools, trained and hired tens of thousands of teachers, made higher education a very real possibility for millions—where once it was a luxury reserved to the very wealthy.

They made a start, although a late one, in healing the scars of the earth and in fighting pollution and the destruction of our natural environment. They set into motion new laws giving conservation in this country new meaning, and they set aside land for you and your children to enjoy for generations to come.

And, while they have done all these things, they have had some setbacks. They have not yet found an alternative to war, nor for

racial hatred. Perhaps you, of this graduating class, will perfect the necessary social mechanisms by which all people may follow their ambitions in peace and freedom.

But they—your parents and grandparents—made more progress by the sweat of their brows than in any previous era and if your generation can make as much progress, in as many fields, as they have, you should be able to solve a good many of the world's and the nation's remaining ills.

So, on this graduation day when we recognize the accomplishments of so many, I would like to recognize and commend your parents and grandparents here tonight, ask them to please stand, and I believe you will agree with me that they, too, deserve a resounding round of applause.

It has been said that "change is the sign of a growing society, a fertile mind, and a restless spirit." Change is not only good for society, it is *absolutely* essential if society, as we know it, is to survive and prosper. And, change is all about us. In New York, an IBM computer has been taught to play checkers so well that it has defeated the Connecticut State Champion five games to one. Automation is taking over 35,000 to 75,000 jobs each week—jobs previously held by people.

Change, however, should *not* be made just for the sake of change. There must be reason, purpose and need. Life, as you all know, is a continuing series of personal and social adjustments and, sometimes, it is *we* who must be ready and willing to change. In fact, as people, we must have the maturity to change *ourselves* if we can't change *things*, if we do not or cannot adjust to situations we soon find ourselves on a collision course where the irresistible force meets the immovable object.

WHAT IS TRUTH

One of the fundamental questions that has always bothered man and is *particularly* troubling to this generation of young people—is the age-old question of truth.

A modern song of the day, asks the question: "What is truth?"

The dictionary defines "truth" as—"the state of being the case." But many people today are asking what the case *really* is—"what is truth?"

Speaking of the truth, I'm reminded of the recent high school graduate who was out looking for a job and, during an interview with a prospective employer, was asked: "Do you smoke?"

"No," said the young man.

"Do you drink?"

"No," he replied.

"Then your primary recreation must be going out with girls?"

"No," said the young fellow.

"Do you mean to tell me you don't have a single vice?"

"Oh yes," the young man admitted cheerfully. "I lie a lot!"

But, "what is truth?" John Collins called truth "the object of philosophy, but not always of philosophers". George Bernard Shaw said it was "the one thing that nobody will believe". John Dryden described truth as "the foundation of all knowledge and the cement of all societies".

In an age when there is so much condemnation of the so-called "Defense Establishment" in this country, let me read you what General MacArthur had to say about the truth:

"And in the end, through the long ages of our quest for light, it will be found that truth is still mightier than the sword. For out of the welter of human carnage, human sorrow and human suffering, the indestructible thing that will always live—is a sound idea."

Nowhere is the government being questioned today, more than the American involvement in Vietnam and Southeast Asia. And, one of the reasons for this, no doubt,

has grown because of the Government's failure in the early 60's to *explain* our involvement in Southeast Asia in a way that people could understand, accept, and believe—they simply did not communicate properly and tell it like it was!

Today, the "gulf of alienation" in this country is so wide that increasing numbers of Americans are taking the attitude that all military matters "smack of evil," that there is *indeed* a dark conspiracy between the military and industry to spend the Nation into bankruptcy and to keep this country at war as long as possible. A strong wave of neo-isolationism is sweeping over America—a feeling that this country can and should crawl into a shell and just forget its role in global politics, which I might add, is consistent with what the Soviet Union would "like to see us do".

Yet, the truth is—that it was the leading and most prominent military leaders in this country that advised against sending large-scale American forces to Vietnam, including General Eisenhower, General MacArthur, General Taylor and General Ridgeway.

The shock and outrage with which some Americans view our presence in Southeast Asia, while understandable, comes at a time when Red China has developed and tested nuclear weapons and when the Soviet Union is seeking to broaden and make permanent its influence in the Middle East and Latin America.

Now, we find many Americans demanding a complete end to military spending in this country as their idea of how to keep America out of war in the future.

Yet the truth is—that it was this *same* kind of isolationist attitude back in the 1930's that laid America wide open to attack at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Today, people cry out for us to admit our mistakes in Vietnam and to set aside "national honor" in favor of an immediate, unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.

Yet the truth is—that many mistakes have been made in Vietnam and history may well record that the biggest of *all*, was getting involved militarily in Vietnam in the *first* place.

In my judgment, there just is no logic whatever in blaming the military for the tragedy in Vietnam. The responsibility must rest for the mistakes and the misjudgments with those at the policy levels of government who over-ruled military advice *not to get involved* with ground combat troops and get "mired down in a land war in Asia."

You will recall that I first spoke out in criticizing the way the Vietnam situation was being handled, as early as 1965. However, in my view, blatant criticism, by itself, is not enough—unless you have an alternative solution.

With this in mind, I advanced the "Phase-in/Phase-out" concept through the creation of a Free Asian Regional Security Organization."

"Vietnamization" is underway and American men are being phased-out of the primary ground combat role, trained Free Asians are being phased in to key security positions and the withdrawal of Americans is proceeding on an announced schedule.

Over 120,000 men have returned home and 150,000 more are scheduled for withdrawal.

I wish the policy makers four to five years ago would have taken this approach—I'm convinced we'd be a lot closer to peace and security today.

Each day I receive letters which, in the main, tell me that the writer is "opposed to war and killing and destruction." One of the outgrowths of the present division in America over the war in Vietnam, is the *completely* false notion that *some* people *oppose* war and others support war.

Yet, the truth is—that, *anyone* who loves war, as Hitler said he did, or believes in war as an effective instrument for resolving in-

ternational differences, is either *insane* or a *demagogue*. War is the *epitome* of man's inhumanity to man. This war and all wars are dirty, inhuman and *stupid*—just as a fist fight and riots are unproductive, damaging and stupid. Yet, history is filled with conflicts and disagreements among men and nations that end up in fights or war.

But, the truth is—you don't end a war by the wave of a pen, passing a bill, or painting a peace sign on the wall. Anyone who tells you that there is a bill pending in the United States Congress that gives any positive assurance of ending the war in Vietnam, is just *not* telling the truth or else he is totally unaware of the facts. There *is* no such bill, resolution or amendment and, if there were, every Member of Congress, would literally *stampede* to the floor of the House or the Senate in order to vote for it—if there was any guarantee that war would cease and the killing would stop.

The President of the United States has recognized and publicly stated that there is *no* military victory to be won for the United States in Vietnam in the classic sense, and, instead, he has begun the phased withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. While the pace of that withdrawal may not satisfy everyone, I think it is important to point out to you that history is replete with examples of military withdrawals that ended in *disaster* for the people involved, not the least of which was Dunkirk, during World War II.

And the truth is—that, *nowhere*, does the Constitution make the *Congress* responsible for the lives and safety of American fighting men, *especially* during a withdrawal. This, my friends, is the responsibility and the *sole* responsibility of the President of the United States in his role as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and no amount of Congressional initiative toward ending the war, however laudable, can relieve the President of this clearly stated constitutional responsibility.

As your Representative in Congress, I want to make it indelibly clear that I want American troops out of Vietnam as quickly as possible. I want the war in Vietnam ended tomorrow, if possible—but, I want it ended in a way that will *prevent* future Vietnams from happening. I want peace here at home and abroad—but I want peace *with freedom*—not peace at any price!

AMERICA STANDS IN CRISIS

In attempting to speak the truth to you here tonight, I would be extremely remiss if I did not address myself to one of the many real crises in which our country and our people now find themselves.

Each of you, I'm sure, has formed your own personal opinion of the society in which you live and the policies of your government, both at home and abroad. Some of you, no doubt, are frightened by what is happening and unsure of the future and your role in a very real world, during this jet-nuclear-space era.

There is an atmosphere growing in this country that is, indeed, frightening. The militants of both the extreme left and the extreme right are forcing Americans to make a very narrow choice—and that choice is whether we are going to have *anarchy* or *repression* in this country.

History teaches us, and make no mistake about it—if that choice *must* be made, even with reluctance and misgivings, the American people will choose repression over anarchy.

Recently, the highly respected Senator from Maine, Margaret Chase Smith, had this to say:

"Twenty years ago, it was the anti-intellectuals who were spreading fear and suspicion around the country and out of that 'narrow choice' came the McCarthy Era of the so-called 'know-nothings'."

Today, it is the militant intellectuals who

demand better communication but who, in effect, "hear nothing".

Speaking as a "Representative of all the people" I note with particular concern the division that is on the increase in the body politic. Americans are shifting from a centrist position to either the right or left and, rather than seeking to understand the causes and nature of our strife, we seek, instead, to cast blame! The extremists of both sides, growing stronger with each passing day, come into direct conflict with each other—first in verbal violence, then in the street.

The forces of division, unreason, hatred, suspicion, bitterness and fear are hard at work today, in a cleverly organized manner, on both sides of the political and philosophical spectrum—and unless and until we, as people, stop shouting and return to reason, I am deeply concerned for the future of our country.

LEAVING SCHOOL

In a very short while, you will be leaving Arcata High School—for some, never to return. For most of you, the last four years have been a transitional period. Your early precepts of life have been subject to constant change and revision. You've made friendships that will endure for an entire lifetime. You've been exposed to the greatest teachers and instructors this society has ever been able to produce. And you've gained a keen insight into what the real world, and your part in it, is all about.

For some of you, the total impact of leaving school, your friends, and the faculty—has yet to really hit and it probably won't until some time later. But, never fall, sooner or later you will come to the full realization of just how much Arcata High School really means to you, how much you actually learned here, and how much you are going to miss it.

Whatever you do and wherever you go—you will always be, and rightfully so, creatures of your own environment and I would like to leave you tonight with a few thoughts.

The world of tomorrow is what we make it today. We can build or we can destroy it—our ultimate success depends on that which we, as individuals contribute.

STOP THE WORLD

Many of you, as students, are being caught up in an upheaval which you played no part in making and over which you have very little control. More than anything else, however, you want to live and you want something to live for. Many of you are tired of trying to correct evil and injustice an inch at a time. You are tired of the fun and games, as well as the "Mickey Mouse" rules and goals of past generations.

Something has to be done. For 6,000 years people have marched onto the stage of life to play their part in the longest-running drama on record—"The Drama of the Ages". In so doing, man has read his lines, performed his part, and marched off to the unending rhythm of the unfinished symphony. But now the script calls for a finale and you, understandably, want to help write it.

A while back a Broadway play was produced with the intriguing title—"Stop the World, I Want To Get Off!"—no doubt a reflection of those who have grown weary of the vicious pace of life as it really is.

In all candor, I am in a very difficult and awkward spot—not sure whether I'm a member of the establishment in good standing, or obviously too outdated for the "Now Generation". But in either case, no one had to drag me into the "Decade of the 70's" under protest.

When I see the excitement, the challenge, and the opportunities that lie ahead for you, I am more inclined to want to say: "Stop the world, I want to get on!"

And, this is your cue. The world needs a change for something better. But, are you willing to work for that change? If I were to ask each one of you tonight what you felt to be the greatest change that is needed, I'm sure a vast majority would say: "PEACE"! And, you are right, without question.

But, man's search for peace did not begin with the first peace march in Washington and it won't come through rebellion, anarchy, violence or "pot."

Peace, in the final analysis, can only come about through a change in the hearts of men. Today's world needs more than social gospel and we can't extinguish a world going up in flames with a sprinkling can.

The truth of the matter is, we can't stop the world and "getting off" is a one-way trip to nowhere.

We are all painfully aware of the young people who have already rejected a society they believe offered them no faith, no dignity, and no hope. It is a pity that such young people were lost to themselves—and to us.

What we have left, however, is a large number of genuinely decent and intelligent young people who could become the elite of a very exciting future that is yet possible. They make no melodramatic gestures—they have thus far watched in silence and uncertainty. But, inwardly, they are by far the most discontented of all. Many of them are puzzled and bewildered by what they have witnessed in their communities, on their campuses, and in Southeast Asia and they are really sure of only one thing—they are sick of the whole mess!

It is not my intent tonight to try to dissuade you from standing up for what you believe is right. Nor, is it my intent to try to still the young voices of dissent that are being heard in the land today—for they are free voices in a free society and must not be stifled!

I do implore you, however, to keep an open mind and be true to yourselves. I beg you not to "fall in line" just because it's "the popular thing to do"—we must all maintain our idealism—but it must be balanced with an equal measure of realism.

There are serious problems in this country and you know what many of them are because you and your generation have literally become experts on the environment and on ecology. But, I would remind you, that there is also a spiritual ecology, a pollution of the heart, and a poverty of the spirit that, sooner or later, must be dealt with, before it is too late.

While your peers are consumed with the hopes and dreams that the "Age of Aquarius" is upon them, the simple truth is—that no past generation has ever witnessed or participated in the excitement and revolution of change as your generation. Never has a generation been called on to understand and define the limitations of change as yours has. And, no generation has ever faced the challenge of initiating change that yours has.

Many of you have participated in or observed a school play in your lifetime. For you, the "Class of 1970", the rehearsal is ending and the stage is being set. You are about to assume your role, in shaping history, in the upcoming "Drama of the Ages"—the longest running play on record. You are being called on now to recite your lines, perform your part, and march off to the never ending rhythm of the unfinished symphony. As you will learn, this script has no finale—it's been going on for 6,000 years.

Graduating Class of 1970—the stage is set—the curtain is rising—with a life full of challenges ahead—YOU'RE ON!

Good luck and God bless you.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES J. TURRISI

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on this momentous day, as we make the most significant change in our postal system since its establishment by Benjamin Franklin, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the lifetime service of one man, Charles J. Turrisi.

Charlie Turrisi is going to retire shortly after nearly 50 years of postal service. He began his career on June 16, 1921, as a regular clerk. He was promoted to supervisor on August 15, 1943, and he is now general superintendent of mails in the Norfolk Post Office.

To know Charlie Turrisi is to love him. Few citizens can combine so much official and unofficial public service. He has always been active in the civic affairs of Norfolk, and he was the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award from the Junior Chamber of Commerce for outstanding civic activities.

He is a charter member and past president of the Civitans of Norfolk. On two occasions he was presented their Civic Achievement Award, and he was also given the Honor Key, the highest award of Civitans International.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many accolades that can be given to Charlie Turrisi, but I would like simply to insert an article that appeared in the Norfolk Ledger-Star on June 1, 1970, highlighting the distinguished career of this marvelous public servant.

I personally count him as a good friend, and I am proud to have him as a constituent in my district.

The article follows:

RETIREMENT WON'T SLOW HIM DOWN

(By Tom Laughlin)

NORFOLK.—Peppery little Charles J. Turrisi can now slow down.

But the chances are he won't.

"I don't want to wither on the vine," Turrisi said on the eve of his retirement after 49 years in the Post Office here.

Turrisi has to hold some record for perseverance and zeal in attacking problems he feels need righting.

And on a lower key, he has his roses and his Italian cooking to keep him fairly busy after his July retirement.

Turrisi, general superintendent of mails here, has become something of the resident authority on roses, and the gardens at his home on Azalea Garden Road have been a focal point for some of the most outstanding displays in the area.

And, both he and his wife are widely known as culinary artists, each vying with the other in friendly competition.

His wife Pearly, keeping the competition alive, has transcribed a special cheesecake recipe into shorthand, just to keep it away from her husband.

It is hard for a man who has, nearly all his life, "stayed on the bicycle," working tirelessly in a widely spread variety of endeavors, to pick an outstanding moment.

But sitting back in his office, his voice cascading words in spurts, Turrisi came up

with the thing that has meant most to him in his long career.

It was when he scored a triumph as one of the leaders attempting to get Public Law 68 passed, allowing supervisors in the Post Office to get increments in their pay scales.

Until that time—the law was passed in 1955—superintendents in the department, whether they had been in their position for one, ten or more years, were paid the same. The law set up incremental pay increases for time in service.

Turrisi began the fight in 1946, fighting opposition both from the federal government and the National Association of Postal Supervisors, in which he was active.

He went to Washington, D.C., almost straight from a hospital bed, in 1955, after almost ten years of fighting, to testify before Congress in support of the bill.

It was passed the next year.

Turrisi, has also involved himself in gaining recognition for people who don't believe in the statement, "I don't want to get involved."

As far back as 22 years ago, Turrisi, then president of the Norfolk Civitans, was a leader in having the Civitans move the unmarked grave of one Elwinn Hepple to one that was marked with a monument to his heroism.

Hepple was an Australian seaman who saved two Norfolk women who had fallen into the Elizabeth River, losing his life in the process.

And he is still working on getting Post Office recognition for a South Carolina rural mail carrier who saved a man from a burning truck, sustaining serious injuries himself. That was back in 1955.

The cudgels were taken up by Turrisi in 1956 when he met the injured mailman at Duke Hospital. Since that time, Turrisi has been at work trying to get recognition for the man, and seems to be on the verge now of success.

Now it's to the roses and the kitchen. And, in August, a visit to the family home in Sicily.

It seems probable that Turrisi will no more allow himself to "wither on the vine" than he would one of his lovely roses.

INVASION OF BALTIC STATES

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this week marks a sad but very important anniversary in world history. It is the Soviet invasion of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

This day also signifies our necessity to reaffirm our dedication to bringing world peace to all captive nations.

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, on June 15, 1940, the Balts have waged an intensive effort to bring freedom to their land. Although this struggle has not been graced with the fruits of victory, these people have never given up hope for a brighter future.

It is appalling to realize, moreover, that since 1940 these three nations have lost more than one-fourth of their population.

On this important anniversary, I would also like to bring to my colleagues' attention House Concurrent Resolution 416, which calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

As a Nation which has been founded on the precepts of democracy, we must maintain the spark of freedom in nations which face anguish under Soviet domination.

I would, therefore, like to extend my remarks today to honor our captive nations and to reaffirm our commitment to bringing peace to the entire world.

MRS. MARGARET WILSON—A LEADING LADY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when women are clamoring for equal jobs, equal pay, and equal opportunity in the business world, it might be interesting to note that some of them have made it, and I present for the record the very attractive and dynamic head of one of Austin's leading department stores, Mrs. Margaret S. Wilson who is president of Scarbroughs. By her own admission, she is one of very few women presidents who head up sizable department stores. Mrs. Wilson has other "firsts" to her credit, too, as you will note from the story which ran in the New York Times and which I would like to reprint for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think you will agree with me that Mrs. Wilson does many things and does them well, combining motherhood and her career with exceptional agility and perhaps paving the way for other women with executive ability to follow:

FEMININE HAND GUIDES TEXAS RETAIL STORE (By Elizabeth M. Fowler)

Women shoppers create the tempo in retailing, but men sit behind the desks in most top executive offices. In Austin, Tex., there is one notably attractive exception.

Men retailers do a double-take when they meet Mrs. Margaret S. Wilson, a photogenic 39-year-old mother because the number of women presidents of sizable department stores can be counted on a few fingers.

Mrs. Wilson, who heads Scarbroughs in the Texas capital, doesn't know any others except Geraldine Stutz, who heads Henri Bendel, which is more accurately described as a specialty store.

This year Mrs. Wilson became the first woman director of the National Retail Merchants Association, and she has quite a few other "firsts." For example, she is the first and only woman on the executive council of the National Industrial Conference Board, an economic research organization. Currently she is the only woman member of the Young President's Organization. Some weeks ago Bruce A. Gimbel, president of Gimbel Bros., was elected chairman of the American Retail Federation, and the chairman-elect for the following year is Mrs. Wilson.

Her retail career began "about age one" because her father headed the store founded by her grandfather in 1893.

"As a child I straightened the stock," she said. Later as a teenager she worked part time—summers, Saturdays and during Christmas holidays.

When the time for college arrived, she chose to go East to Smith College, Northampton, Mass., where she lived part of the time in French house, a dormitory where only that language is spoken among the students.

Smith, like many other colleges, offers a junior year abroad, but she decided to spend hers "at home"—at the University of Texas, in Austin.

"I wanted the experience of a coed university," she explained, adding, "I also wanted to know more Texans, and I wanted to make more business contacts because I knew I was interested in the family business."

She decided to stay there her senior year studying business administration and received a bachelors degree.

Then she joined the store, spending her time as assistant to her father, the president. "One assignment proved a turning point for me," she said.

It involved the expansion and rejuvenation of the store's gift department, which she renamed the "home accent Department." From a simple gift center it became a much larger purveyor of ideas for the homemaker—tying in unusual furniture items, knick-knacks and gifts for gracious living.

"We're a medium- to better-priced store," she explained, adding "We have some of Saks, Lord & Taylor and Bloomingdale's" in the store's make-up and approach.

Around the tree-lined corner where Scarbrough stands in downtown Austin is a lower-priced center operated by the store. The trees also were Mrs. Wilson's idea. She was invited to lunch with Mrs. Johnson at the White House during the Johnson Administration to discuss beautifying America.

Scarbroughs is a medium-sized store with volume of about \$10-million yearly and returning about 2 per cent profit after taxes on sales.

"We have 100,000 square feet," she said. How much is that in terms of a store? To dramatize the point, Mrs. Wilson glanced around the vast Edwardian room of the Hotel Plaza where she was having lunch. "Each floor is about four times the size of this room and we have four floors."

Before she assumed the presidency in 1965, following the death of her father, Mrs. Wilson rounded out her apprenticeship working in personnel, finance and other administrative areas. In a highly competitive business such as retailing, this has helped give her a broad view from the executive office.

She lives a busy life, divided among her five-year-old daughter Nancy (Mrs. Wilson was divorced in 1966), occupying the president's office, and traveling around the country for her various commitments, looking in on other stores to see what they are showing and keeping up with new marketing ideas.

Discussing problems she confessed that like all retail stores Scarbroughs had been faced with heavy shrinkage losses, amounting to about 2 per cent of annual sales. Shrinkage is the trade term among retailers for theft either by customers or by staff members, and failure of internal systems and practices.

Still another problem is what to do about growth. Mrs. Wilson has chosen to follow the market to the suburbs. In 1971 Scarbroughs will open a large store in a shopping center at Austin's outskirts.

In the next five years she hopes to almost double current sales volume. "We're not interested in being acquired," she added. She is a strong believer that a well-managed, family-owned store with individuality can survive in the highly competitive, department store field. So does her mother, now in her sixties, an inactive owner of the business, and her brother Lem, who is a vice president.

Currently she is taking sides in the mini-versus-midi-battle in a striking way. She was dressed last week in a snappy two-piece navy-blue suit, midi length covering the tops of shiny boots.

"Our dress business is off sharply because of the fashion battle," she commented. Scarbroughs has not yet received midis in large volume. Meanwhile, Texas women have held

back their dress buying, perhaps bothered also by the hot weather.

"Boots are not feasible in Texas during spring and summer," she noted.

For the store's fiscal first quarter—February through April—sales over-all held up well in comparison with last year, thanks to natural growth factors, but in May there was a noticeable drop. Even so the four months ran about level with 1969 sales for the period, a disappointment to the growth-minded president.

STEVE HAMAS—A GREAT ALL-AROUND ATHLETE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, through the history of sports there have been very few great all-around athletes. One of these was Mr. Steve Hamas, a leading citizen of Wallington, N.J., in my congressional district.

In the golden era of sports, Steve excelled in basketball, football, track, and boxing at high school, college, and professional levels. In the 1925-35 era, his name and feats were well known to every sports fan in the Nation and in many areas of the world. His awards and accomplishments were many.

Now another honor has been bestowed upon Steve. He has been inducted into the New Jersey Boxing Hall of Fame. As a longtime friend and admirer of Steve, I am pleased to place in the RECORD a story from the Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., telling of the event and giving some of the sports and personal history of this great all-around athlete:

STEVE HAMAS—A GREAT ALL-AROUND ATHLETE

(By Mike Galos)

When Wallington's Steve Hamas jokingly said "sure" one day in 1927, he never imagined that his reply would have affected his life the way it did.

As a junior at Penn State University, Hamas began boxing because the Nittany Lions needed a heavyweight for the 1927 intercollegiate championships. On Sunday, more than 42 years later, Hamas along with Tony Galento, Mickey Dell and Willie Gradwell, will be inducted into the New Jersey Boxing Hall of Fame at the Greenbrier Restaurant, North Brunswick.

A letterman on the famous Passaic Wonder Team of the 20's, a team his late brother Mike starred on, Hamas moved to Wallington and graduated from East Rutherford High in 1925.

Hamas went on to earn All-East honors in basketball, honorable mention All-America as a halfback in football, and to participate in track at Penn State. Thanks to being in the right place at the right time, Hamas was the intercollegiate heavyweight boxing champion in 1927 and 1928.

AGREE TO FIGHT

Once basketball season ended, Hamas liked to stay in shape by working out daily at the campus gym. One afternoon, Nittany Lion boxing coach Leo Houck asked the versatile athlete if he would give his roommate a workout. Hamas' shared a room with Marty McAndrew, who at the time was intercollegiate lightweight champ.

Figuring his roommate wouldn't hit him too hard or too often, Hamas agreed, and managed to survive the sparring session. He thanked McAndrew for allowing him to "stay vertical," to which his buddy replied, "Steve, I really tried to knock your block off."

Hamas' showing prompted coach Houck's invitation to represent the school at the intercollegiate championships. Not taking the coach seriously, Hamas replied, "Sure, I'll clean house" and left the gym thinking his boxing days were behind him.

The next day the coach met Hamas who was smoking a cigarette on campus, and frantically asked what he was doing. How could he box if he was going to smoke? Realizing for the first time that the coach was serious, Hamas, "put out the cigarette and went to workout."

The intercollegiate boxing championships began the following Saturday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. By the time the heavyweight bout rolled around it was past 2 a.m. Hamas was to meet Dynamite Joe Lavoti of host Syracuse University. All Lavoti had done was knockout seven opponents in a row, all in less than two minutes.

FIVE-YEAR CAREER

Since an injury suffered during football made his right hand useless, Hamas had to rely entirely on his left, and somehow he made it through the first round without tasting Lavoti's strong right hook.

Between rounds coach Houck asked Hamas if he had ever thought of trying to hit the man, so in the second he attempted a left jab and connected, drawing blood from Lavoti's nose. The fight continued this way and, much to Hamas' surprise, he got the decision.

After the fight, he went on to win his next bout and take the heavyweight crown. Hamas came back to successfully defend his crown the following season.

Born in Passaic, Hamas came from a family which included five boys and two girls, and the appeal of professional boxing and its big purses caused Hamas to enter the professional boxing world after graduation.

His career spanned only five years, but in 40 fights, Hamas won 31 bouts, lost three and had six draws.

Twenty-six of Hamas wins were by knockouts. His biggest victory was a 12 round decision over Max Schmeling in Philadelphia in 1935 in Schmeling's first fight after defeating Joe Louis.

Hamas' boxing career came to an abrupt end later in the year when Schmeling handed Hamas the only KO of his life in their return bout in Hamburg, Germany.

VERSATILE ATHLETE

Hamas was truly a versatile athlete, winning 13 letters in three years at Penn State in football, basketball, track and lacrosse.

He tried a year of pro football in Orange while teaching physical education at East Rutherford High School, his alma mater.

While at East Rutherford he introduced a program of boxing instruction.

One thing Hamas always hoped to do was repay his family for his education and finance his way through medical school. His career was an illustrious one and he estimates his total earnings from the ring to be approximately \$50,000 in four and one-half years.

Even though he didn't get to medical school, boxing proved beneficial for Hamas and his induction to the Jersey Hall of Fame is a fitting climax. If he had the choice to make again, his reply would definitely be, "sure!"

A TIME FOR POLITICAL COURAGE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is an old American saying: "Put your money where your mouth is." The President has

reminded us that the principle behind that saying applies in politics: When a Congressman wants to spend money—the taxpayers' money—let him also show where that money is going to come from.

As the President said:

The American people expect their elected officials to do their political arithmetic honestly.

This means those who seek to get votes by spend, spend, spend had better come up with ways in which that money is going to be found, found, found.

This is no time for politics as usual. It is time for political courage. If there is any critic of the President who can show how money can be found to pay for grandiose schemes, let him do so. But if he cannot, then let him join with the President in holding the line.

Let us do our political arithmetic honestly. It means we count the cost to the consumer instead of counting votes when it comes time to vote for spending bills. We have a President who has given us a magnificent example. Let us follow him.

SETTING THE PACE

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, only last week, as this membership debated and then voted, 374 to 1, to provide for the most effective and complete program to improve the quality of the Nation's air, dramatic moments were recorded on this vital subject right in Saginaw, Mich., as the huge Saginaw Malleable Iron plant of the Central Foundry Division, General Motors Corp., started its new electric furnace which eliminates air pollution from cupolas.

At ceremonies in the largest city in our Eighth Congressional District, phase one of Malleable Iron's effort to prevent air pollution, was concluded at a cost of \$6 million and phase two, which will cost an estimated \$13 million was started.

Phase one, as thoroughly explained by Malleable plant manager, Arthur J. Karam, in the following articles which appeared in the June 8, 1970, edition of The Saginaw News, focused on the performance of a new 65-ton melting unit, the largest coreless electric induction furnace ever used.

The second phase will provide two more of the 65-ton coreless induction furnaces for daily operation, mental charge preheaters, auxiliary equipment, and a 65-ton spare furnace to supplement the operational units.

In the fine editorial which appeared in the June 10 issue of the News I would point out the statement by Central Foundry Division's Manager, Elmer E. Braun who said:

We have, I believe, demonstrated by word and deed for almost a quarter of a century our determination to control the environmental problems created by our operations.

Saginaw Malleable Iron, by word and deed, certainly has proved it is an industrial good citizen and neighbor. It has set high standards and outstanding exam-

ples for all industries and individuals to follow in the years ahead.

The articles follow:

MALLEABLE IRON GOOD INDUSTRIAL NEIGHBOR

Foresight and a several-million-dollar outlay are among the marks which once again are proving that the Saginaw Malleable Iron plant is an industrial good citizen and neighbor.

Its new pollution-free electric furnace is the latest in a series of General Motors' Central Foundry Division antipollution moves, dating back to long before pollution became a national issue.

In 1946, the year after World War II ended, Central became one of the first foundry organizations in the nation to equip all cupolas with pollution-control devices. Constant efforts during the succeeding 24 years have kept Central among the country's antipollution leaders.

Saginaw Malleable's two-phase project, which began in 1968, is due to end in late 1972. Cost of the program is \$19 million. When the operation is completed, pollution-producing cupolas will have been replaced entirely with effluent-free induction furnaces.

The transition is taking place a step at a time so melting operations can continue at a high level to keep from idling employees.

Also, it's worth pointing out, the entire program has been accomplished without federal funds.

Meanwhile, Malleable has not ignored water pollution or aesthetics.

Waste water from plant production flows into outdoor settling basins, is processed and recirculated into the plant.

Landscaping has turned the foundry's waterfront into an eye-pleasing green area, a sight far more welcome to river travelers than most other riverside industrial and commercial land.

And one of the things we like best, Central Foundry Division didn't wait to be told. Sure, it knew the tons of smoke billowing from its cupolas was wrong and admittedly it fouled the air for many years. But two decades before the current pollution crisis campaign, Central was developing technology to meet the need.

It started cleaning up after itself at a time when industrial smoke and soot were considered a sign of prosperity—or at worst, just a nuisance—and when waste water flowing into rivers was considered merely unsightly. This is not to say it had not been pressured—it had—but it could have slid along for years without action, as many others have. It is to the credit of Saginaw's Chevrolet Foundries Division, also, that it too is well along in an effort to control smoke emissions.

Central Foundry spent \$14½ million for pollution-control facilities in the 1960s alone and will be spending much more, Division Manager Elmer E. Braum said this week.

"We have, I believe, demonstrated by word and deed for almost a quarter of a century our determination to control the environmental problems created by our operations," he said.

Not many other manufacturers started that early. With Central Foundry and Grey Iron's efforts, Saginaw is well on the way to solving its air pollution problems.

It will be many years before the rest of the country catches up . . . and this is a mighty good way to be a national leader.

SAGINAW MALLEABLE STARTS POLLUTION-FREE FURNACE

Air pollution is on its way out at the Saginaw Malleable Iron plant here.

Brief ceremonies took place this morning marking the installation of a new electric furnace which eliminates the air pollution from cupolas.

The ceremony marked the end of phase one, costing \$6 million and marked the start

of phase two which will cost an estimated \$13 million.

Guests of the Malleable Iron Plant and its parent Central Foundry Division were civic and governmental leaders and news media representatives. They saw an operation in sharp contrast to past foundry operations.

Speaking at the ceremony, Plant Manager Arthur J. Karam said phase one had seen the successful break-in performance of a new 65-ton melting unit, the largest coreless electric induction furnace ever used.

"We are very satisfied with the new furnace's performance," Karam said, "and are pleased with the significant improvement in effluent control resulting from electric melting."

The second phase will provide two more of the 65-ton coreless induction furnaces for daily operation mental charge pre-heaters, auxiliary equipment and a 65-ton spare furnace to supplement the operational units. Phase two also calls for a major building addition to house the three furnaces, new electrical and material handling systems, removal of a portion of the old melting equipment and renovation of some existing facilities.

"By late fall, 1972, we expect the plant to have three of the big furnaces in operation and a fourth which can be quickly placed in operation if needed," Karam said. He completed the program we announced in February, 1968. If more molten iron is needed to meet our production requirements than these furnaces can provide, a third phase will then be added.

"Our program is costing more and taking longer than a conventional program to control the effluent created by cupolas," Karam continued, "and I would like to explain why."

"Our first objective, the replacing of our coke-fired melting units with modern, more flexible equipment, is to enable Saginaw Malleable to better fulfill our customers' casting requirements and thereby continue to serve the Saginaw community as a major employer. This, we believe, to be of primary importance to Saginaw as well as General Motors.

"Our second objective, by selecting electric induction furnaces as our primary melting equipment, is to achieve the ultimate form of emission control—elimination of the source. The electrical energy, which provides the heat for induction melting, produces no effluent, and that created in the melting process can be readily controlled. We want to be a good neighbor and also consider this objective of prime importance.

"The transition from cupolas to induction furnaces is being made as rapidly as possible. Time is needed to procure the new equipment and construct the massive installations required to house the units. The transition can only be done a step at a time because melting operations must continue at a high level to keep from unnecessarily idling large numbers of employees."

Central Foundry Division Manager Elmer E. Braum said this morning, "We have effectively controlled any water pollution previously resulting from our manufacturing operations by building primary and secondary settling basins and recirculating the water used in our processes.

"We have installed the most efficient air cleaning equipment available on four of the division's operating cupolas and are proceeding with all practical speed to install similar controls on all cupolas to be retained.

"We are installing coreless electric induction furnaces, the most emission-free method of melting iron, wherever new iron melting systems are needed and in Saginaw as replacements of existing cupolas.

"We have in the past 10 years (1960 through 1969) spent \$14½ million for pollution control facilities and will be spending much more."

PLANT EMISSION CURE NEAR

Efforts of the Central Foundry Division to control water and air pollution were traced this morning by Thomas R. Wiltse, division works manager for civic and government leaders at the Malleable Iron Plant this morning.

Central Foundry Division's Malleable Iron Plant Manager Arthur J. Karam this morning announced the successful installation of a huge electric furnace which eliminates the cupola and the cupola air pollution.

The installation climaxes 25 years of trying to control the environmental problems created by the foundry's operation. Here is a chronological report on those efforts.

The coke-fired cupola has for more than 70 years been the most efficient and most commonly used device for melting raw materials to make iron. There are more than 450 cupolas in operation in Michigan alone. The very nature of cupola operation requires the exhaust of high velocity, high temperature, volumes of air which pick up and carry dust and small solid particles. Many efforts to control this emission have been made but few met with much success until recently.

Central Foundry's efforts here date back to 1946 when it was one of the first in the nation to equip all cupolas with the then new "wet cap" emission control units. With these controls, emissions from the cupola is forced to pass through a heavy curtain of water before reaching the atmosphere. The water removes up to 60 per cent of the particles from the effluent. Progressive improvements of this system has been made by increasing the volume of water used, and changes in design of the collectors.

In 1959, Central Foundry enlisted the aid of the General Motors Corp. Research Laboratories in developing a small experimental cupola gas scrubber. This led in 1960 to the installation of a low-energy wet Venturi scrubber for one cupola at the Malleable Iron plant here. This device has increased efficiency but proved to be somewhat unreliable with high maintenance costs.

The next effort came in 1963 at the Central Foundry's Danville, Ill., plant. This consisted of the design and installation of a recuperative dry-type fume collector. Hot gases collected from plant operations were to be used to heat the air being blasted into the cupola for melting purposes and thus provide some return on the investment.

However, after two years, the project was abandoned when a possible explosion hazard could not be satisfactorily resolved.

Central Foundry then experimented with extending the cupola stacks at Danville and Saginaw to provide space for gas after-burners which would more completely incinerate the emission. Four cupolas were changed and a further improvement in the emission resulted.

In 1966, a new type high-energy wet Venturi gas scrubber was installed at Central Foundry's new Defiance, Ohio, plant. This high-efficiency unit permits no more than five grains of solids per 100 standard cubic feet of cupola effluent with a steam plume being the only visible emission.

While highly effective, this new type of equipment required a capital expenditure of \$1 million and considerable space. Current cupola emission control codes are being set using this equipment as a standard.

Central Foundry since has installed high-energy Venturi scrubbers on two of the three cupolas in the original Defiance plant and is preparing to install a unit on the third cupola. One of three cupolas at the Danville plant already has been equipped and plans include installation of Venturi scrubbers on all operating cupolas before the end of 1972.

Convinced that even larger furnaces were practical, Central Foundry in 1968 announced a five-year program of progressively replacing the three cupolas at its Saginaw Malleable Iron Plant with giant coreless elec-

tric induction furnaces. Each furnace, with pre-heating of the material to be melted, was to have a melting rate of 40 tons per hour and a holding capacity of 65 tons. In addition to eliminating the plant's major emission problem, this ambitious program would provide modern, flexible melting systems as replacements for the cupola melting units.

ONE-SIDED REPORTING BY A NEWS AGENCY

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good bit of controversy lately over whether the news media in our country are giving us responsible, unbiased coverage of events. Many executives of the various organizations which operate newspapers, broadcasting stations, or other news-gathering agencies are extremely sensitive to any type of criticism of their performance.

The Honorable Earl Morgan, district attorney for Jefferson County, Ala., has called to my attention a good example of one-sided reporting by a news agency. The Associated Press recently moved the following story, which was carried in newspapers all over the country:

A \$30 ROBBERY BRINGS NEGRO DEATH PENALTY
BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—An all-white jury has decreed the death penalty for a Negro convicted of robbing a white girl of \$30 and a wrist watch.

The seven women and five men of the Circuit Court jury deliberated less than three hours Thursday night before returning the verdict against John Henry Jones Jr., 23.

Mr. Morgan has furnished me with the accurate facts in the case, and I would ask that they be printed in the RECORD. I sincerely hope that the Associated Press will see fit to issue an apology to the people of Alabama for this apparently deliberate slap at our State.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY EARL C MORGAN

On a Saturday afternoon last fall, a seventeen year old girl named Rose Marie Campisi was reported missing and was last seen at a local hospital where she had taken her brother for emergency treatment. Late that afternoon search parties were organized and throughout the following day search continued for this young girl. On Sunday morning, the members of her church, mostly young teenagers, organized a search party under the direction of the church priest and approximately 4 o'clock that afternoon, while searching an isolated and remote rural area, found a charred envelope with the young lady's name on it. An intensive search of the area revealed her automobile at the bottom of a 100 foot ravine over which it had been driven. Upon searching the automobile this young girl was found locked in the trunk compartment, disrobed, beaten and very seriously injured. She was taken to a hospital where she remained for several weeks and suffered permanent injuries from internal infections which developed in her body. Law enforcement agencies of state, county and several municipalities spent days and weeks searching out every possible lead in an attempt to find the culprit. In addition to having been beaten and run over by an automom-

bile, there was every indication that she had been raped.

For months the case went unsolved until on January 1, 1970, a young Negro woman made a complaint to the Birmingham Police Department that she had been raped on the previous night. Similarities of description and mannerisms of the culprit in that case resulted in the arrest of John Henry Jones, Jr., and charges being placed against him arising out of offenses committed against both women. Rose Marie Campisi's wrist watch, which had been forcibly taken from her at or about the time of the rape, was recovered from a local pawn shop and John Henry Jones was identified by the operator as being the person who pawned the watch. When arrested, John Henry Jones had the pawn ticket for the watch on his person. Rose Campisi made a positive identification of this defendant from photographs and from personally viewing him among a large group of persons. Additionally, with full constitutional guarantees and the Miranda procedure followed, Jones made and signed a written statement admitting having forced the young girl into her automobile and leaving the hospital area with her but claimed not to remember subsequent events partly because of a high degree of intoxication.

Rose Marie Campisi testified that after the defendant abducted her at the hospital, he drove her to an isolated area in a rural community, where he stopped the car, dragged her from it, beat her with his fists, kicked her, stomped her, dragged her seventy feet into the woods, stripped her clothing from her and shot over her head as she struggled to try to prevent him from removing her panties. She further testified that he raped her, drug her back on to the roadway where he tied her hands and feet together, placed her in front of the car and ran the car over her arm and leg, she having succeeded in squirming out of the path of the wheels as they passed over a part of her body. She further testified that the defendant then put her in the trunk of the car in this bound condition, laughed at her, slammed the trunk door on her and she then knew the car was being driven into the ravine because of the crashing and bumping. She remained in the trunk of this automobile for approximately twenty-four hours, being conscious most of the time.

When the car was found it was substantiated that the defendant had obtained all available paper material in the car and set it on fire prior to running the car into the ravine.

John Henry Jones, Jr. was indicted in four separate cases for the offenses of Kidnaping, Assault With Intent To Murder, Rape and Robbery. Under Alabama law the offenses of Rape and Robbery are capital offenses, either one of which carry a penalty from ten years to a maximum penalty of death. Only one case can be tried at a time and the state elected to go to trial on the Robbery case first. Upon a trial of this case on the Robbery charge, the state was permitted to show all the acts of the defendant as set out herein.

PRESIDENT REASSURES THE NATION HE WILL WIN BATTLES AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT AND INFLATION

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's speech today was at once an as-

urance to the American people that he is determined to win the twin battles against unemployment and inflation and a challenge to the Congress to help him in those battles.

I believe we have an obligation to him and to the Nation to join with him in those efforts in a spirit that is both nonpartisan and bipartisan.

The President has said that this is the time for the Congress and the President to cooperate in a program specifically addressed to helping the people who need help most in a period of economic transition.

He has outlined that program and much of it is already before us in the form of proposals to strengthen the unemployment insurance system, to improve our manpower training, to tie social security benefits to the cost of living, to ease home financing, and to help small business.

In addition he intends to send new proposals to us immediately.

I would hope that both houses of Congress will join in meeting the President's challenge to us by acting expeditiously on these needed pieces of legislation.

If we do, the whole country will benefit.

TURKEY, FRANCE AND THE HEROIN TRAFFIC

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, with the thought that it might interest our colleagues, I am submitting for insertion in the record my letter of yesterday addressed to the President on the matter of Turkey's opium growing policies and the \$40 million development loan approved for that country.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1970.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Today I spoke on the Floor of the House to express my concern over your approval of an AID development loan to Turkey while that country continues to permit the growth of opium in nine of its provinces.

Mr. President, I am sure that I need not tell you that in New York City, as well as in other parts of the country, we are faced with an acute heroin epidemic. The lives of thousands of our adolescents are being ruined by this drug addiction—and yet we continue to sanction the opium growing policies of Turkey which produces 80% of our heroin.

I believe that the time has come to put a stop to this, and I urge you to press the Turkish government during the negotiations over this \$40 million loan to eliminate entirely the legalized growth of opium and to use what part of this loan is necessary to provide the facilities for crop conversion and police surveillance.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that much of this Turkish heroin is processed in the Port of Marseilles, I would respectfully urge you to have our Ambassador discuss with President Georges Pompidou the immediate closing of these death dealing factories. I

realize that politics is an important consideration with regard to this issue in both of these countries, but we cannot afford to go on paying for the politics of Turkey and France with the lives of our children.

I am enclosing a copy of my remarks in the House.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

SOVIET UNION IN VIOLATION OF
INTERNATIONAL LAW

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago the Soviet Union in violation of international law invaded the independent Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. All three of these countries were forcibly "annexed" into the Soviet Union shortly after this invasion by illegally staged "elections," which were held under the auspices of the Red army's guns. The United States and many other nations of the world have refused to recognize this illegal "annexation."

It is appropriate to remind the world community that the historic legal and moral principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples should be shared by the peoples of these Baltic Republics who were illegally deprived of their independence and self-determination by the Soviet Union.

It is also appropriate to reaffirm our dedication to the principles expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 416 calling for the freedom of these enslaved peoples. I urge the President to implement this legislation by bringing the issue of the Baltic States peoples to the United Nations. The resolution reads as follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its efforts to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people; Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

SEAWEED, THE NATURAL
FERTILIZER

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent statement recently made by Mr. Per B. Ohrstrom, of Sea-Born Corp., before the Subcommittee on Departmental Operations of the House Committee on Agriculture, in connection with its hearings on June 8, 1970, on H.R. 15560 and H.R. 16576 to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have for some time been very much impressed with the great potentials of the resources of the sea. Seaweed, a natural product of the sea, merits increased attention and use because of its nonpollutant qualities, especially at a time when the subject of pollution is of such great concern to mankind.

I would emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the time is now for us to support the torrent of rhetoric by at least a trickle of practical steps toward the correction of conditions which contribute to creation of the problems we rail against. The record abounds with testimony that chemical phosphates and other compounds are already critically diminishing the oxygen content of rivers and streams and is dangerously destroying the marine life support in our estuaries.

It is in the hope that the Agriculture Committee will initiate appropriate action that I insert this important statement at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF SEA-BORN CORP., BEFORE THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, my name is Per Bye Ohrstrom. I am General Manager of the Sea-Born Corporation, 3421 North Central Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Sea-Born Corporation is mindful of the initiative traditionally taken by the House Agriculture Committee on vital national and international matters affecting the agricultural community of our land and the American consumer, who depends on agriculture for his very existence. We therefore commend any move designed to protect the American consumer against hazardous, toxic and harmful pesticides and chemicals in agricultural or horticultural use. The emergency nature of this situation has been tersely described as follows:

"Chemical pollution of our soil (as of our air and waters and wildlife) is growing worse. Fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides, chemicals of war threaten not just the good life, but life on this earth altogether."

("The Environmental Decade," House Report No. 91-1082, May 13, 1970, Committee on Government Operations, page 36).

The widespread use of poisonous chemicals for both the home trade and for commercial use is, hopefully, being successfully curtailed or even eliminated where required. Yet the need for control of disease and insects will increase as increased population places an increased demand on our foods and fibers. This is readily apparent when we examine the population statistics. The growth in the United States increased from 13 million in 1830 to 123 million in 1930. By the year 1990, it is expected to reach 300 million. Here, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, the products marketed by Sea-Born Corporation can render a great public service to our growing population in the highest and best traditions of enlightened American private enterprise. At the same time, we can point the way for other manufacturers of such products located in diverse areas of the United States. Indeed, the results can be revolutionary at a time when man and his environment cry out for new concepts to preserve the oldest instinct in man—survival. And we can be instrumental in creating and developing new industries, employing thousands of people throughout the land who will be engaged in producing, marketing and utilizing a safe, non-pollutant and effective product—seaweed.

There is nothing complicated about our products. They are made from *Ascophyllum nodosum* seaweed, which is considered among the best variety offered by the sea. Seaweed is a natural product, non-toxic, non-poisonous, containing no harmful ingredients, safe on foods and completely harmless to children or animals. Our liquid seaweed, which is marketed under the "Sea-Born" label, for horticultural and agricultural use, is hydrolized under pressure and contains the breakdown products of the seaweed polymers together with the various elements which are included in sea plants.

Seaweed contains all the known elements essential to good plant nutrition. Due to its high level of organic matter, seaweed aids in retaining moisture in the soil, thereby improving the stabilization of the soil surface, and seaweed raises the bacteria count in such soil. These are qualities that are important to raise healthy crops, with improved resistance to insects and disease. Seaweed activates plant hormones which have an important effect on root development and general plant growth. An important property of seaweed is its possession of auxins and gibberellins which are important growth materials. Auxins give increased resistance to fungal disease.

For the last 12 years, our company has been actively engaged in research and marketing of ALGIT Norwegian Seaweed Meal, which is used as an animal feed supplement, and Sea-Born liquid and Granular Seaweed for horticultural use. "Seaweed," as marketed by us, is processed from the harvested plants which are either dried and ground or extracted with an absolute minimum use of any agents.

ALGIT, which is used as an animal feed supplement, is processed from the *Ascophyllum nodosum* seaweed, alluded to earlier. Our product is manufactured by the leading seaweed producer in Norway and is the only Norwegian seaweed meal on the market which is quality controlled by the Norwegian Government Agricultural Control Institute.

Seaweed or Kelp (popular names for plants grown in salt water of the algae family) was approved as a feed additive by The Association of American Feed Control Officials, Inc. in 1961. There are actually no government-control problems in marketing this ALGIT product for animal feed supplements. It is interesting to point out that the U.S. Depart-

ment of Wildlife & Fisheries has been using our ALGIT in their fish food for many years. One of their divisions in St. Paul, Minnesota, is using it in their trout food, and we have supplied this division for about 10 years. The feed, to which ALGIT is added as a supplement, is made by Glencoe Mills, Glencoe, Minnesota. However, in the case of the marketing of the SEA-BORN seaweed products in horticultural and agricultural use, there has developed a serious impediment to our operations. Under date of July 14, 1969, the Department of Agriculture, Pesticides Regulation Division, requested that if we were to continue to be exempt from the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, we would have to delete certain claims from our literature and in some cases not to use our literature at all. In a spirit of cooperation, Sea-Born Corporation agreed to this course of action. The results have been severe. Despite the fact that much research backed our claims, and despite the fact, as pointed out earlier in this statement, Sea-Born is non-poisonous, we informed the Pesticide Regulation Division that we were prepared to register our product under the Act. This we are not permitted to do, as it is claimed that the test plots for the research should have been located over wider geographical areas and that the research on which we rely is therefore insufficient.

Our experiments on vegetable crops were mainly carried on at Clemson. Extensive work with Sea-Born on peaches was carried on in South Carolina, New Jersey and Connecticut. Smaller experiments on apples were conducted in New Jersey and Connecticut. These tests on apples and peaches were carried on for five consecutive years, which we felt would be adequate for meaningful results.

The results from these tests show that Sea-Born significantly suppresses mite population in apple orchards and inhibits the development of some other insect pests.

The experiment on peaches definitely showed that Sea-Born significantly reduced rot in peaches and increased the marketable yields. Information from the Department of Agriculture clearly documents that millions of bushels of peaches are ruined by rot every year. This huge economic loss could be greatly reduced if these growers were permitted to be informed about our non-toxic and non-poisonous product and what it has accomplished for others.

The finding from the experiments in the United States show the same pattern as those from experiments in Europe. In this connection, we would like to refer to Proceedings of the Fifth International Seaweed Symposium, Halifax, Canada, 1965, and the Proceedings of the Sixth International Seaweed Symposium, Santiago de Compostela, Spain, 1968.

The last Symposium was attended by 290 scientists representing 34 nations. Some 110 scientific papers were presented. Among those from the U.S. taking part were scientists from Clemson University, Duke University, University of North Carolina, North Carolina State, University of California and University of Texas.

One of the best and most graphic descriptions on the qualities of seaweed, its present uses and its great potential for the future, appeared in *The Washington Post* of December 21, 1969, written by Nate Haseltine, *Washington Post* Staff Writer, which I include substantially in its entirety, as part of Sea-Born's statement. (Appendix I)

At a time when the special and vital role of small business is recognized and protected by our Government, thanks to the initiative of the Congress, it is inconceivable to us that we should be compelled virtually to go out of business for no valid reason. We recognize the topmost priority which should be placed on the protection of public health and the environment. And we applaud the

efforts spearheaded by the Congress to bring our Administrative laws and regulations in line with this priority. It is precisely because of these considerations that our small company has spent literally thousands of dollars in research, conducted primarily at Clemson University, S.C., which has been doing such remarkable work in pioneering new and better agricultural products, free from contamination and disease. We commend the leadership of Dr. Robert C. Edwards, President of Clemson University, Dr. O. B. Garrison, Director of Agricultural Research, and Dr. T. L. Senn, head of the Horticulture Department of that great University, who have contributed so much to the research on seaweed. Research has also been done by many other U.S. scientists, including:

Dr. B. F. Driggers, Rutgers University.
Dr. Philip Garman, Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station.
Dr. C. E. Caltagirone, University of California.
Dr. C. G. Forshey, Cornell University.
Dr. Preston Hunter, University of Georgia.
Dr. I. C. Anderson, Iowa State University.
A partial list of research papers is appended hereto. (Appendix II)

The results of this research have been truly remarkable and are worthy of a special hearing by this Subcommittee to listen to the Clemson story.

It is thus apparent that Sea-Born Corporation is not a Johnny-Come-Lately in the field of pollution and environmental control. Our desire to market a product free from toxicity, free from poison and free from pollutants in animal feed, horticulture and general agricultural use is precisely why we are in the seaweed business. We realize that had we devoted our efforts to chemical fertilizers and pesticides these past 12 years instead of the natural product, seaweed, we would have by now evolved into a big business, not a small one. We prefer, however, to remain a small business dealing in a natural and safe product such as seaweed.

All we ask is that the law be amended, if necessary, to permit us this choice. The essence of the amendment we urge the Subcommittee to adopt in the bills before you (or, indeed, in any other appropriate legislative vehicle available either to this Subcommittee or to the full Committee) is to exempt our product from the definition of an "economic poison" and the requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. If this is not feasible, then at least, that law should be amended or perhaps clarified in the Committee report so as to permit our product to be registered under the Act on the basis of our presently available research, accumulated over many years.

It is not our desire to criticize those who administer the Act, and our testimony is not to be interpreted in that light. It is the Act itself which is deficient, too flexible where it should be firm and too firm where it should be flexible. Clearly, we do not feel that the Congress in enacting the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, legislation which has been on the books for 20 years, had our type of product in mind. In view of the barrage of Congressional criticism leveled against deficiencies in administration of the Act (House Report No. 91-637, November 13, 1969), we can understand the concentration of effort by the Pesticides Regulation Division on tightening the administrative reins rather than concentrating on the encouragement of safe and efficient substitutes, like seaweed, for the noxious chemicals.

In summary, seaweed research in the United States and abroad has demonstrated that:

(1) Seaweed is a natural organic product, and is completely safe and harmless;

(2) Seaweed increases the population of beneficial soil organism;

(3) Seaweed increases seed germination and stimulates blossom and fruit development;

(4) Seaweed produces plant hormones which have an important effect on the root development and general growth;

(5) Seaweed increases the up-take of several trace elements;

(6) Seaweed permits the use of less chemical fertilizer;

(7) Seaweed serves as a repellent to insects;

(8) Seaweed permits the use of less insecticide;

(9) Seaweed improves the natural quality of a product on which it is applied through increased sugar content, starches, flavors and color;

(10) Seaweed increases marketable yields on all crops tested;

(11) Seaweed increases shelf life on fruits and vegetables.

We would not conclude this statement without mentioning the fact that research and development has been expanded and accelerated to find even more useful properties of seaweed.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, we are confident that you will take the leadership in confirming officially what has been confirmed by a great body of national and international research and further confirmed by those who actually utilize seaweed in their farms, fields, gardens and orchards—that seaweed is the hope of the future and a healthy replacement for toxic, harmful and poisonous chemicals.

We recommend that the bills before you be amended so as to exempt seaweed from the requirements of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. As a minimal alternate, we recommend inclusion of language in the Committee report that Sea-Born Corporation should be permitted to register under that Act on the basis of the research now readily available to us.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee for affording Sea-Born Corporation an opportunity to present its views on the important legislative proposals before you.

[From the *Washington Post*, Dec. 21, 1969]

APPENDIX I

STUDENTS OF SEAWEED GET THE LAST

LAUGH—PLUS FUNDS

(By Nate Haseltine)

Nineteen years ago, they laughed at a research team at Clemson University in South Carolina that was testing dried Norwegian seaweed as an additive for crops. But now, everyone seems to be trying to get into the seaweed research act.

This year, the National Science Foundation is providing some \$389,100 in matching federal grants under its Sea Research Program for expanded agricultural research into the seemingly miraculous powers of dried, powdered and liquefied seaweeds and other marine algae. Most of the grants are being matched with similar amounts by states and local universities.

Clemson's Drs. Senn and B. J. Skelton have been awarded a matching grant of \$39,500 to expand their program of "testing extracts and meals of several marine algae for effects on growth and/or development of commercially higher plants."

This expanding research funding contrasts with the original \$1,200 grant given the Clemson investigators by the producing company, the Sea-Born Mineral Division of Skod Co. and the Norwegian Export and Import Co. of Chicago, which furnished the seaweed product used in the initiating research.

The brown seaweed involved, *Ascophyllum nodosum*, has been shown to turn plant growth off and on by regulating plant me-

tabolism—that is, the rates at which they take in oxygen and give off carbon dioxide. Used as a soil additive, it is either mixed with or sprayed on ordinary earth. A particular reason why the Clemson investigators were persuaded to take on the research was that South Carolina's soil is not the best in the agricultural United States, having been depleted of many growth-inducing minerals.

The original Clemson researchers included C. B. Garrison, then director of the Clemson Experiment Station and the university's agricultural research; Taze (Tee) L. Senn, presently the director, and research associates John A. Martin, Claude L. Darling and Robert J. Shelton. They started in 1950, and their reported results are now considered hallmarks of plant and crop improvement—the reason why everyone else is getting into the act.

FIVE-MONTH DORMANCY

Scientific reports accumulated since the start of the Clemson trials show that the seaweed meal added to the soil does some amazing tricks to growing plants.

One of the research assistants who joined the Clemson project later, Donald F. Fox, reported in 1960 to the American Society for Horticulture that the sea meal, spread over an acre of Bermuda grass, killed off all clovers and weeds. He reported that it left only the desired green grass in an almost ungrazing state and that the grass survived a hot summer without need of mowing.

Fox also reported to the same society that seaweed-treated tomato plants an inch and a half tall retained their size, without wilting or growing, for up to five months. Transplanted to normal soil after such apparent dormancy, they resumed normal growth and bore fruit, he said. Similarly treated plants, accidentally left out and exposed to frost, survived the chilling which killed off untreated (control) tomato plants, Fox reported.

When Clemson's pioneering research scientists set out to evaluate the nutritive values of seaweed for crops, they lacked the scientific equipment available today and painstakingly built a Rube Goldberg type of contraption called a "Continuous Recording Respirometer System."

Respiratory, or breathing, activity provides a means through which the investigator may study the complex enzymatic processes governing the quality of perishable horticultural products. In the respiration in storage of fruits and plants, the sugars are biologically oxidized to carbon dioxide and water by the living cells.

The scientists could tell by the looks, taste, feel and shelf life of seaweed-promoted products that they fared better than control plants—but such proofs are always open to question. So the scientists spent two years devising the machinery to convince other scientists that their work was valid. They ended up with a device that has a maze-like array of tubing, sample containers, solenoid valves and a dual-channel potentiometric recorder.

"It took us all that time to build it," mused Dr. Senn. "After all, we're plant physiologists, not electric engineers."

Today, the Clemson horticultural laboratories are equipped with space age electronic gear ranging upward to \$2000 in cost when purchased commercially. These include an atomic absorption spectrophotometer and a recording print-out of a gas chromatograph.

FEEDING RACE HORSES

Because their institution is a land grant college, the Clemson investigators started their research on local crops, chiefly tomatoes and grasses. Since their initial successes, they have branched out to other South Carolina products, such as peaches, apples, sweet potatoes and okra. In all cases,

they found out which concentrations produced the best results in both qualities and storage life. But they still don't know why, other than knowing it is associated with each particular plant's regulation of respiration.

Although almost nothing, scientifically, is known of the sea product's biological effects except that it is inert and harmless, testimonials have been given that meal made from the kelp is a good additive to horse and cattle feeds, producing national champions in both species, and that as an additive to turkey and other poultry feeds, makes for better tasting birds.

One of the testimonials, which await scientific confirmation, is by an Iowa breeder of Herefords who reported that Algite Norwegian Kelp Meal as an additive helps his cattle to "utilize their feed more efficiently." His breeding farm, he said, this year had five champions, one reserve champion and 24 first-place winners at cattle shows.

Still another testimonial was given by Bill Ballenger, manager and part owner of Virginia's Blue Ridge Farm, who said he raised two racing greats—Sword Dancer (1959 Horse of the Year) and Bowl of Flowers—in pasturage augmented with the Norwegian kelp.

Whether the seaweed adds to human nutritive values is another facet that remains to be studied. The company does sell compressed seaweed pills, in volumes of 500,000 to 700,000 a year, for the mineral values they contain, and this has been the bane of research on seaweed—keeping it out of the food faddist category.

It has been reported that this particular Norwegian kelp contains 60 elements, 21 amino acids and 12 vitamins. It is not considered a fertilizer because it contains no substantial amounts of nitrogen. The company has tagged it a micro-organism "balancer."

POSSIBLE FOOD SOURCE

In a scientific report of September, 1961, Dr. Senn noted evidence that "certain marine algae possess antibioticly active substances," but he didn't go as far as to credit these with the plant nutritive activity of this kelp.

The Senn report noted that large metal drums containing virgin South Carolina soil remained unchanged over years, but that other drums filled with soil to which kelp had been added in varying concentrations developed molds on the earth's surface.

For example, his report showed: One barrel with 5 per cent seaweed mixture had aspergillus, neurospora and penicillium growths; 10 and 20 per cent mixtures had mostly penicillium growth, and a 40 per cent mixture showed no mold growth.

In a recent interview, Dr. Senn attributed the growth-promoting factors in brown kelp to auxins, perhaps gibberellin, a plant fungus substance that acts as a growth enhancer. Auxins are plant hormones that promote cell extensions—growth.

Not only Norwegian kelp but also many other seaweed species, including some closer to American shores, need intensive study as possible major food source to help feed starving populations. Dr. Senn and his colleagues agreed. That is also one reason given by the Sea Resources Research programs financed by the National Science Foundation.

APPENDIX II

1. Aitken, J. B. and B. Acock. 1963. The characteristics and effects of humic acids. Proc. Assoc. South. Ag. Workers 60th Ann. Conv. p. 235.

2. ———, T. L. Senn, and J. S. Martin. 1961. The effect of varying concentrations of Norwegian seaweed (*Ascophyllum nodosum*) on Duncan grapefruit and Pineapple orange seedlings grown under greenhouse conditions. Clemson College Dept. of Horticulture, Research Series No. 24, September.

3. Bentley, J. A. 1958. Role of plant hormones in algal metabolism and ecology. Nature 181:1499-1502.

4. ———, 1961. Auxins and gibberellins in marine algae. Fourth International Seaweed Symposium. Biarritz.

5. Booth, E. 1953. Seaweed as a fertilizer. Organic Gardening 21 (6): 14-17.

6. ———, June 18, 1960. Seaweed, the Romans Valued It. Popular Gardening, p. 37.

7. ———, Nov. 26, 1960. Seaweed, a Cheap Soil Conditioner. The Grower.

8. Chesters, C. S. C. and Stott, J. A. 1956. The Production of Antibiotic Substances by Seaweeds. Second International Seaweed Symposium. Pergamon Press, New York, pp. 49-54.

9. Childers, James T. The Effect of Seaweed (*Ascophyllum nodosum*) on the Quality, Yield and Marketability of Peaches. M.S. Thesis, Clemson University, May, 1965.

10. Conniff, James C. G. May, 1960. Miracle Drugs from the Sea. pp. 52-65.

11. Derting, C. W. 1962. The effect of liquid seaweed extract upon the rooting of *Rhododendron maximum* and *Ilex crenata rotundifolia*. M.S. Thesis, Clemson College, 67 p. Clemson, South Carolina.

12. Fox, Donald F. 1960. The effect of seaweed on plant growth. 57th Ann. Meeting Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci., Oklahoma State Univ. Stillwater, Okla.

13. ———, 1961. The effect of seaweed meal on the growth and development of geranium (*Pelargonium hortorum*, Bailey) Cultivar Improved Ricard, M.S. Thesis, Clemson College. 37 p. Clemson, S.C.

14. Franki, T. H. 1958. The effect of seaweed on the availability of manganese in the soil. 1958 International Seaweed Symposium.

15. Kononova, M. M. 1961. Soil Organic Matter: Its Nature, Its Role in Soil Formation and in Soil Fertility. Pergamon Press. New York.

16. Lesser, M. A. 1950. Alginates in drugs and cosmetics. Econ. Bot. 4(4): 317-321.

17. Martin, J. A., T. L. Senn, J. H. Crawford, and M. D. Moore. 1962. Influence of humic and fulvic acids on the growth, yield, and quality of certain horticultural crops. Clemson College Dept. of Horticulture, Research Series No. 30, May.

18. Quatsel, J. H. and D. M. Webley. 1947. The effects of the addition to soil of alginic acid and of other forms of organic matter on soil aeration. Journ. of Ag. Sci. Vol. 37, p. 257.

19. Russell, E. Walter. 1961. Soil Conditions and Plant Growth, 9th Edition. Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., New York.

20. Senn, T. L., J. A. Martin, J. H. Crawford, and B. J. Skelton. 1960. The effect of kelp meal on development and comparison of various vegetables and special crops. Proc. Assoc. South. Ag. Workers 57th Ann. Conv. p. 182.

21. Senn, T. L., J. A. Martin, J. H. Crawford, and C. W. Derting. 1961. The effect of Norwegian seaweed (*Ascophyllum nodosum*) on the development and composition of certain horticultural and special crops. Clemson College, Dept. of Horticulture, Research Series No. 23, September.

22. Smith, Joseph. 1961. Sea farming. Farm Quarterly 16(2): 72-73.

23. Stiles, Walter. 1946. Trace Elements in Plants and Animals. The MacMillan Co., New York.

24. Van Overbeek, J. 1940. Auxin in marine algae. Pl. Phys. 15:291-299.

25. Wallenkamp, J. O. 1955. Treasure from the sea. Organic Gard. and F. 2(3) 52-53.

26. Driggers, Byrley F. Effect of Sea-Born Liquefied Seaweed on European Red Mite Populations on Red Delicious Apple Trees over a Five Year Period. Rutgers University.

27. Garman, Philip. Seaweed Extracts as Fruit Sprays. Connecticut Agricultural Expt. Station.

EVERYONE WANTS TO SAVE THE ENVIRONMENT BUT NO ONE KNOWS QUITE WHAT TO DO

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in a recent issue of the Center magazine by Mr. Frank M. Potter, Jr., executive director of the Environmental Clearing House.

The Center magazine is the publication of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and the article entitled "Everyone Wants To Save the Environment But No One Knows Quite What To Do" merits careful consideration by a race of men much troubled by environmental destruction in our land today:

EVERYONE WANTS TO SAVE THE ENVIRONMENT BUT NO ONE KNOWS QUITE WHAT TO DO

(By Frank M. Potter, Jr.)

It is difficult to find a newspaper today that doesn't have at least one story on environmental problems. People who read these stories react to them and, with increasing frequency, their reaction is sympathetic. Environmental concerns are no longer the private preserve of the birdwatchers: the same bell tolls for us all.

In 1969, the National Wildlife Federation commissioned two polling organizations to investigate American attitudes on environment. The polls reached the conclusion that most people are actively concerned about environmental problems and would prefer that a greater proportion of their taxes be devoted to the costs of solving them. The level of concern here rose with income and varied inversely with age. Over fifty per cent of those interviewed felt that the government was devoting insufficient attention to environmental problems and was providing insufficient funds to resolve them. Over eighty per cent felt a personal concern, and most of these registered "deep concern." What, then, keeps them from the barricades?

Apathy, one might think, but the surveys rule that out. The most significant inhibitor of action may be that we are too easily convinced of our own political impotence. The larger the grouping, the more difficult it is for any person to make a significant impact upon social decisions.

On the other hand, when they are really aroused, people can take and have taken effective action. For example, a coalition of citizens joined forces in 1969 to require a reluctant U.S. government to quadruple the amount of funds to be used for waste-water facilities. They did so by informing their elected representatives that this was a matter of specific, personal, and urgent priority; their representatives listened and responded. Again, a few years ago, a small group of citizens banded together against the largest utility in the United States, opposing plans to construct a major hydroelectric plant within fifty miles of New York City. They stopped the utility company in its tracks. That company was Consolidated Edison, the plant was the Storm King project. The Federal Power Commission, which must decide whether or not the plant should be built, has still not made its decision. The strong case made by the citizens depended in large measure on the fact that they were able to propose alternatives to the project and to support their case by a wealth of technical and engineering detail that showed New

York's serious power problems could be met by less damaging methods. Although Con Edison has not yet given up the project, it has adopted the alternatives, and many sophisticated agency-watchers now consider it unlikely that the Storm King plant will ever be built.

Collective action, then, can make a difference. Individually or collectively, we are confronted with a clear option: Are we to live well only for a short period, or must we cut back economic growth in favor of long-term survival for the species? For the most part we appear to have adopted the former course of action, and it is by no means clear that we would act much differently if the choice were clearer. "Après moi, le déluge" is an attitude confined neither to France nor to the eighteenth century. As individuals, we tend to be somewhat ambivalent about the importance of what might be called an environmental conscience.

With very little effort, we could educate our children about the importance of environmental responsibility; yet it is the children who seem to be taking the lead in educating us. A national Environmental Teach-In is scheduled for April, 1970, in schools and colleges across the country, and there are signs that problems of pollution are occupying a rapidly increasing portion of the attention of young people.

It is important to distinguish between the actions and attitudes of individuals and those of the citizen groups organized to consider environmental problems. The biggest problem faced by such groups is seldom a lack of motivation; it is financial. It is still rare for anyone whose economic interests are involved to oppose a polluter; this means that concerned citizens must themselves assume these costs, although the financial burdens of speaking out and working against a powerful and well-financed industry or government agency may be great. The costs of carrying on a major controversy may exceed five hundred thousand dollars. We cannot reasonably expect any private group to bear such a burden, nor should we as long as the group is acting to protect assets that are common and valuable to all of us.

It is important to note, though, that even concerned citizens do not always organize themselves to protect the environmental system as a whole—one group may be interested only in visual pollution while another is interested in noise. It is an unfortunate fact of life that a normal resolution of a pollution problem often means pushing it into another area which may not be so vigorously defended. For example, the public concern with power-generation facilities producing air pollution in the form of coal dust, oil droplets, and increased sulphur dioxide emissions encouraged the building of nuclear plants, which involve none of these pollutants but may well present other problems in terms of radioactive and thermal pollution of cooling water.

To look to private business for solutions to pollution may be futile. Its horizons are deliberately limited to those factors which are considered to be of immediate importance, principally economic, and the hidden costs to the society at large tend to be ignored. These costs still exist, however, and they must be borne by everyone if not by the industry which creates them. A classic example would be a pulp processing plant which emits fumes of hydrogen sulphide, causing foul air and peeling paint for miles downwind. The resulting inconvenience, possible health hazards, and certain increases in maintenance costs have not traditionally been imposed upon the agency which created them. Instead, they have been borne by our whole society, regardless of the capability or willingness of individual members to bear them.

To be sure, some private companies have taken steps to limit the anti-social conse-

quences of their operations and have done so at considerable cost, quite beyond what they have been required to assume by law. But a voluntary approach to reducing environmental problems, it is clear, is just not good enough. For one thing, the forces of competition tend to minimize such voluntary efforts. Few men or companies, however public-spirited they may be, are prepared to expend large sums on the internalization of indirect costs. Nor can they do so without incurring the wrath of profit-seeking stockholders, who are even further removed from the environmental mischief they have indirectly created.

Polluting industries have most often resisted pressure to clean up their operations by claiming that the measures proposed are unduly prohibitive or confiscatory. Their chief means of resistance has usually involved threats to pull up stakes and move elsewhere. This last resort has been adopted infrequently, if at all, and is only likely to occur where a producer has found himself impossibly squeezed between falling profits and rising costs. It has also been alleged that these are the marginal producers whom the next strong wind will blow away in any case, so that little lasting economic damage to the area ever occurs.

The mechanics for balancing social costs against economic values, then, must be found outside the private institutions themselves, and they are—this is a major function of government. The laissez-faire philosophy which at one time characterized the attitude of American government toward American industry won't work today. It is also apparent that the government is likely to expand its program in this area. Public attention has already been focused on air and water pollution. But there are other areas in which governmental action must be anticipated—among them, noise, solid-waste disposal, and the by-products of energy transfer are mentioned with increasing frequency.

Governmental over-view, if impartially and reasonably imposed, need not be hostile to the private sector; it may even be in its interest, both short-termed and long-termed. The National Association of Manufacturers has never been known as a hotbed of social activists, yet members of N.A.M. operating committees have endorsed proposals for a strong federal body to oversee environmental issues. Businessmen have to breathe, too, and most of them are prepared to accommodate themselves to the ecological imperative—as long as their competitors are subject to the same rules. We cannot assume, however, that increased governmental concern will take place without some economic disruption. Marginal producers will feel the pinch most strongly, and some may not survive. Nevertheless, the important consideration is that the rules must be enforced fairly and impartially upon all parties.

It is important to bear in mind that the mass of government workers—the *Lumpenbürokratie*—marches to a drumbeat that only it can hear. Higher levels of government, presumably more responsive to broad social needs, generally find their choices so circumscribed by business-as-usual decisions farther down the line that their options are dissipated by the inertia of the machinery. This is by no means peculiar to the solution of environmental problems, though these tend to be somewhat more acute because of the high stakes involved and because the new issues do not fit easily into the existing bureaucratic patterns.

In practically every agency of government, at almost every level, strong pressures to maintain the status quo are built up. As one progresses from local to national bureaucracy the inertia increases. A random example: early in the nineteen-fifties the Eisenhower Administration stated a strong preference for private power development as

against public power, but it was not until the Kennedy Administration took office eight years later that the direction of bureaucratic thinking had changed enough to give effective support to the idea of private power. Nor could the Democrats reverse the trend.

There are also powerful personal influences that, in current bureaucratise, are "counter-productive." As one observer put it, "the paramount objective of the permanent bureaucracy is permanence." This contributes directly to the institutional resistance to change. Agency employees tend to react self-protectively. This was probably the principal roadblock encountered by Ralph Nader's "Raiders" in their government agency investigations during the past two summers. They often ran up against a bureaucratic wall which blocked the publication of several unfavorable agency reports on the controversial supersonic transport until the reports were wrenched from unwilling bureaucratic hands by actively concerned congressmen. To combat this reaction Congress passed the Freedom of Information Act, requiring disclosure of all but certain specified documents—a public law which has been honored far more in the breach than in the observance.

This problem is compounded by a frequent lack of clear policy guidance from the upper levels of government to the lower. New policies may be found in new regulations and pronouncements which either go unheeded or trickle down by word of mouth. This communications system serves as an efficient filter for any content that may fortuitously have crept into the public statements of the man or men at the top.

Such difficulties should not be ascribed solely to bureaucracy. The problem for bureaucrats is essentially the same as that of the private citizen: they are unable to relate everyday decisions to any specific action of the government machinery. Moreover, the results of yesterday's decisions are rarely communicated to the decision-makers as a corrective for tomorrow's programs. To be sure, there is enough feedback for everyone to know when a dam doesn't hold water (which happens), but when a dam destroys a delicate ecological balance and wreaks havoc in the local community, the mischief is rarely perceived as a genuine problem.

Still another troublesome aspect is that government agencies compete with one another. For decades, to cite an example, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture have carried on a polite war; its prime casualties have frequently turned out to be considerations of the environment. Countless examples of this competition have been observed: timber-cutting practices on public lands and in national forests, pesticide regulation (if that is the correct term for it), dam building, and soil conservation are just a few. The same kind of competition may occasionally be found between the public and private sectors of the economy; once again, concern for the environment usually loses out.

In some respects, such competition is healthy. Occasionally, the public may even benefit from it. Several years ago, for instance, the Army Corps of Engineers conceived a plan to build a high dam on Alaska's Yukon River which would flood hundreds of thousands of acres of land in the process. The dam was successfully opposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department on the ground that it would do untold damage to the wildlife in the region. The operative word here is "untold"; no one knew just how much damage would have been done and the Corps was not really interested in finding out.

There are other consequences of governmental competition. Although they operate with public funds, governmental agencies are under pressure to make the most of the funds they expend. The budgetary restrictions placed upon the head of a large operat-

ing government agency are no less severe than those upon the directors of a large corporation, and the body to which they report is no more aware of the importance of environmental factors than the average stockholder of American Telephone & Telegraph. This comparison ought not to be pressed, however, since while it will be difficult to improve the ecological understanding of the average citizen, it is not beyond our grasp to educate Congress.

The essential function of the Legislative Branch of government is to formulate and to review policy. In so doing, it operates under constitutional or other social restraints, and it must of necessity paint with a broad brush. Translating basic policy decisions into specific go and no-go decisions, never an easy task is often complicated by pressures within the Executive Branch to change the policy decisions themselves. More important, policy is only as good as the information upon which it is based, and this information tends to be biased, conflicting, fragmentary, and out-of-date.

Consider the effect of the following factors upon the theoretical non-bias with which a congressional policy decision is supposed to be approached:

The nature of the proposal—Most legislation enacted by the Congress is originally proposed by agencies in the Executive Branch. (This, incidentally, may not be quite so common today; the legislative proposals of the present Administration have been criticized as somewhat sporadic. Many of the bills now before the Congress, however, are holdovers from earlier years, and the basic pattern seems to have changed very little.) Support for these measures tends to be channeled well in advance of their consideration—facts are marshaled, charts are drawn up, witnesses are prepared. A frequent result of this process is that the Congress may focus on the wrong issues.

The congressional committee structure—Committees of the Congress, and especially their ranking members, are among the principal focal points of power in Washington. This apparatus determines which bills are considered, whether testimony in opposition will be considered, and if so, how it will be rebutted. Unless the issue is getting the attention of the press and the public, or unless a maverick congressman digs in his heels, those controlling the committee have a relative free hand in developing the arguments for and against the bill; hence they control its future.

The bias of congressional leaders—The environmental crisis is a relatively new phenomenon, and the young are more concerned with the problems than their elders. This is as true in the Congress as elsewhere. The result is that many of the older members, who exercise greater control over legislative action than their younger colleagues, are less inclined to meet the new challenge. Exceptions can easily be found, but the general truth of this observation is not seriously questioned. There is, then, a bias favoring inaction. It ought not to be discounted.

The adequacy of the testimony itself—Assuming that the measure is reasonable and that the controlling committee is interested in developing the real issues, the witnesses called to testify may nonetheless not be the best available. Witnesses on environmental issues have tended to be the elder statesmen—established scientists and professionals whose views on new problems and on the need for new approaches have been colored by their own studies and viewpoints, which are frequently considerably out-of-date. A review of non-governmental scientific testimony over the past few years shows that several names pop up again and again; these individuals (who may be spectacularly well qualified in their own areas of competence), occasionally edge into areas in which they

are not well qualified to speak, and they often seem to be responding to the unspoken needs of some committee members to be reassured that things are not all that bad, and somehow technology will find a way. Although not every expert witness falls into this category, it happens often enough to constitute a real problem. There is, consequently, a need to develop a base of scientific testimony available to the Congress on environmental issues and to see that younger scientists, whose factual knowledge is more current, are heard.

The context of the legislative decision—Another conflict, not at all restricted to environmental issues, faces the legislator who must decide whether to favor the good of his own constituency over national interests. Thus congressmen and senators from the West are generally inclined to favor legislative proposals to open public lands for development (mining, grazing, lumbering, oil exploration, etc.), whereas the interests of the entire country might seem to favor retaining these lands in a less exploited condition. How to measure the interests of local areas against those of society is a serious question. Resolving the conflict may be one of the most significant functions of government.

The broad nature of the authority and responsibility of the legislature may prevent it from exercising effective control over the actions of the organizations theoretically under its direction. The policies the legislators are called upon to define are so broad they cannot possibly be spelled out in detail, and yet it is in such details that the actions of government become manifest.

The legislative mechanism may also be criticized for its slow reaction time. The Congress is a highly conservative body—deliberate in adopting new courses of action, and slower to change them once they are adopted. This is, of course, a source of strength, preventing today's fad from becoming tomorrow's straitjacket. But it is also a real source of danger to the system. Science and technology have transformed the world of the mid-twentieth century into something that was quite unimaginable fifty years ago. The rate of change is accelerating, and it is a brave man who will claim that he can predict the state of the world in the year 2000. Shrill voices may decry technology and demand that there be a halt to new technological development; they are no more likely to be heeded than were the machinery-wrecking Luddites of nineteenth-century England. Whether they are right or wrong is quite beside the point; barring massive catastrophe, technology will not be significantly curbed and the rate of technological change will almost certainly continue to speed up.

New technology creates new social conventions, which in turn affect legislative policy. Yet the mechanisms for determining that policy are keyed to technological considerations that may have already been out-of-date in 1800, and to decision-making processes that have remained essentially unchanged since the days of Roger Bacon.

Consider massive changes in climate. Scientists tell us that urban development and energy transfer now have a significant effect upon global weather patterns. We hear on the one hand of the "greenhouse effect," which tends to raise atmospheric temperature as a function of increased carbon dioxide production, and on the other of increased amounts of pollution in the air, which tend to lower atmospheric temperature by decreasing the amount of solar radiation reaching the earth's surface. Some scientists, extrapolating present activities, speculate that it would take ten years to decide which is the more powerful effect, and that by then large-scale climatic changes may be irreversible. This view is by no means commonly held, but it is under serious consideration by men whose voices ought to be heard. They are

not given a hearing before Congress; if they were, they might well be outnumbered ten to one by men saying, "We are not certain, we do not know, and we should take no action until we do."

Our ecological problems, then, are not the exclusive province of the Congress; they are those of the scientific community and of all of us who have an interest in human survival. There seems as yet no way to force these problems to the forefront, conjoined as they are with an historically validated precedent for doing nothing—at least not yet.

Legislators tend to focus upon institutions rather than individuals—to see the needs of the larger groups whose existence depends upon traditional thought patterns and legal fictions. A water pollution problem is perceived as that of a municipality or an oil company, an air pollution problem as that of a manufacturer. Yet it is individual citizens whose favor the legislator must seek if he is to survive. This suggests in turn that if individuals can organize themselves to be heard as an institution concerned with environmental survival the legislators will respond. This has not yet happened generally. No significant environmental lobby has yet made its voice heard on the national level.

The courts exist to see that the written and unwritten rules of society are followed; that the policies formed by the people and their elected representatives are observed. Within narrow limits, the courts have been successful in this function. As a means of achieving rational decisions on environmental issues, however, the courts are usually ineffective. Their influence could increase, but this would require a significant departure from the usual legalistic approach. It would involve the recognition of a basic and alienable human right to a livable environment. Such a decision appears to be a remote possibility. Without this new constitutional approach, the courts will almost certainly be hamstrung by inadequate policies adopted by the legislature and by common-law rights which were defined centuries before the current environmental problems appeared.

Only in rare instances can the courts make decisions with more than local force and effect. The U.S. Court in southern New York may properly hold that the federal Department of Transportation must observe certain procedures specified by statute that may have escaped the Department's notice, and for this reason a highway shall not be built over the Hudson River. At the same time, the same Department favors the construction of longer runways into the Columbia River. Technically, the decision of the New York court is not binding in Oregon; the Oregon courts are free to disagree with their East Coast brethren and such disagreements are in no way uncommon. A means does exist for resolving interjudicial disputes—the Supreme Court of the United States. The Court, however, is already operating under a fearful load and can devote only a limited amount of its energies to environmental questions, however important they may appear to be.

The courts also lack the information upon which to base their decisions. The common-law system is grounded upon the adversary system, the theory being that each side will present the most favorable case it can and that the court will then resolve the dispute on the basis of the evidence before it. The environmental problems arising today are very complex—very different from the land disputes and tort actions of centuries ago. In theory, expert testimony ought to be available to both sides to support their cases; in practice, this simply does not work. Even if environmentalists can afford to hire experts (and often they cannot), experts cannot always be found. It is a rare electri-

cal engineer who will agree to take the witness stand on behalf of opponents to a power plant or transmission line; he knows that other utilities may thereafter hesitate to contract with him for services even in circumstances that may be wholly unrelated to the present controversy. Conscientious men do exist and some may be found to testify, but it is not easy to find them. Cases have been lost and will continue to be lost for this reason alone. Without that interplay of expert testimony, the court is at a major disadvantage.

Even if experts can be found by all parties, the court's information problems are not thereby solved. Technical questions are already difficult, and they are growing more complex every day. Judges spring from different backgrounds, but the law operates according to the theory that their experience is essentially irrelevant to the issues that they must decide. Historically, ignorance has been a prime virtue, the court acting as the *tabula rasa* upon which the cases of the opposing parties may be written. This is a manifest absurdity, but it is the way the law grew, and it is a fact that lawyers with weak technical cases prefer judges with little technical competence.

Another weakness built into the judicial system is its tendency to delay decision. Combined judicial and administrative delays have postponed the Storm King decision by five years already. If the parties fight down to the wire, a longer delay is likely. In many respects this delay has worked in favor of the conservation group, but this happy state of affairs is not the rule. Citizens opposed to a particular proposal or project are usually forced to seek injunctive relief from the courts; they may and often do find that this relief cannot be obtained without their posting a substantial bond which is quite beyond their means. The result is that while they work their way through the courts, the opposition is busily building or digging or chopping down. By the time that the court is ready to decide, the essential question has become moot. Injunctive relief is typically the only possible hope for environmentalists, since the alternative is a damage suit, and it is a basic tenet of such organizations that money cannot replace what is threatened.

Constitutional revision has been proposed as a means of providing a clearer and more enforceable definition of our rights to a satisfactory environment. New York State has adopted such a program, and similar efforts have been mounted on a national level. An Environmental Bill of Rights would indeed be a valuable tool, but no such proposal has a chance of even being seriously considered without vastly increased pressure upon the Congress and upon the legislatures of the several states.

Pollution will be inevitable until we can develop adequate tools for dealing with it. The government will never do the job by itself. The solution seems to lie, rather, in putting stronger weapons into the hands of the public—helping it to bring about the necessary reforms through legislative and judicial channels.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET OCCUPATION OF THE BALTIC STATES—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 416

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this month, the Soviets invaded

and occupied the Baltic States. Since then, the people of the Baltic States have been denied the right to live in independence and freedom. As a reminder of this sad anniversary, I wish to insert into the Record a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 416:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN
DENIED INVITATION TO SPEAK

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the majority of Oceanside High School seniors voted to invite AL LOWENSTEIN to be their commencement speaker; that the principal of the school decided not to extend the invitation because Mr. LOWENSTEIN was too controversial. What a great final lesson in democracy for graduating seniors. Now they know how the real world is run. I do hope the speaker chosen does not read the bill of rights. That is really controversial.

What an insult to the entire Congress and to the district which elected Mr. LOWENSTEIN. There have been few young men ever enter this body who have arrived better equipped to be a Member of this body and who have worked as diligently through established changes for relevant changes.

THERE IS HOPE FOR THE FUTURE
OF AMERICAN YOUTH

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, all too frequently it is the radical students, the minority of violent disrupters or the nihilist few that command the headlines concerning news from our college or high school campuses.

In fact, lately our high schools appear to be developing as training grounds for the militant college student who will now go on to higher education with a certain amount of expertise in burning buildings, destroying books and closing schools. This type of training will not make for a successful college student, of course—at least not academically.

However, I was recently pleased to come in contact with a fine high school student, Charles Andres, whose valedictory address to Berwick Academy gives me great hope for the future of American youth. At the same commencement services, the salutatory address of Samuel Sears Mays gave me additional reason to have continued faith in the upcoming generation.

I commend both speeches to my colleagues as fine examples of the thoughts of America's youth. Clearly, their traditions and spirit are in keeping with this country's nearly 200 years of history.

The speeches follow:

SALUTATORY ADDRESS BY SAMUEL SEARS MAYS
AT BERWICK ACADEMY

In these troubled days, I feel that many of us are allowing ourselves to be completely submerged in thoughts and actions that are alien to our true selves. We look innocently around us and see men killing other men, nations developing nuclear weapons, and presidents and others who are not always truly receptive to the populace. We look about ourselves and we see not only these but many more crimes against nature (and we are part of nature though we may have forgotten). And to many these problems seem to be heralding in the end of the world either by the slow extermination of life by pollution or the sudden termination by a nuclear holocaust.

But the real danger I believe lies in that too many of us are always looking outward, witnessing the faults of the world and trying to do something to correct them, but completely neglecting ourselves, never looking inward and studying ourselves. We must not forsake our spirits, our souls, for then we will grow increasingly unstable and lopsided. A person can find everything he needs to know about his true self only by looking inward and as Henry David Thoreau said by listening to the beat of his own drummer. I quote from Walden:

"Why should we be in such desperate haste to succeed, and in such desperate enterprises? If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured and far away."

If we wish to be truly aware of ourselves and the world, we must also not let ourselves be too subjective for that will only harm and drown us in its turmoil. We must obtain a good education in all fields in order to be as objective as possible. The world cannot afford to have men divided up into specialists such as technicians and book-worms with no regard for the other members of the world. And this type of a world will get us

nowhere, except to a world where technology is practiced solely for the purpose of technology and where books are read only as books, as a Third Estate not as thoughts that inspire.

And this is where institutions of learning come into focus. All types of institutions of learning cannot solely teach what has happened in the past without encouraging or at least expecting actions to arise in the future. Ralph Waldo Emerson discussed this with respect to American schools in an essay "The American Scholar." A quote follows: "But they can only highly serve us when they aim not to drill, but to create; when they gather from far every ray of various genius to their hospital halls, and by the concentrated fires, set the hearts of their youth on flame."

Schools can only help to set the hearts of students on fire, but it can only be really accomplished with the will of the individual. Each person must set himself on fire before ever trying to set another person on fire. But the most important thing is to tend first to yourself, but not in a selfish way. Make sure that you yourself are aware of your surroundings, the present, and also of the past.

I feel that one of the major problems of today is that we feel that the contemporary problems have never before confronted man, and that we as conscientious human beings must eradicate them. But most of the problems of the present day have been problems of the past. William Faulkner said in 1950 when he accepted the Nobel Prize:

"There are no longer problems of the spirit. There is only the question: When will I be blown up? Because of this, the young man or woman . . . today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself which alone can make good . . . because only that is worth the agony and sweat."

We must not lose ourselves completely in the world without first having lost ourselves in ourselves. We must find our drummer and follow it; that will probably take a lifetime.

INTO THE SEVENTIES

(By Charles Andes)

Congressman KYROS, Captain Goodwin, Headmaster Burnham, faculty, parents, fellow classmates, students, and friends:

This is the first class that Berwick will graduate in the new decade of the 1970's. Its graduates and those of the coming years are going to live in a time when more problems, more difficult than those facing any of the previous generations are going to demand solutions more immediately. Some of the problems which threaten the very survival of man upon this planet will have to be solved in the next few years by this generation if humanity is to survive. The problems which we have created for ourselves include those related to the staggering amount of pollution each one of us pours forth every single day, the inconceivable growth rate of human beings, the political situations which have the power to annihilate the entire earth within the next fifteen minutes, and the fact that the quality of life upon this planet for the majority of its citizens is declining under the weight of the rest of these problems. Clearly, it is time to take a new look at these problems which face us now; most of which are strikingly different from those of even five years ago. It is time for us to reassess our values and goals; to change them to those ends expounded by the greatest of us throughout history.

First, we must put an end to all forms of war and violence before the weapons and hatred which now exist wipe us out completely. It has been estimated that if this does not occur in this century, there is less than a 50-50 chance for humanity to survive past the year 2000.

Second, we must change our values and type of living, especially in America, from one of "use it once and throw it away" to one

where all homes are self-sufficient, self-contained entities where nothing is wasted or thrown away, but used over and over in endless cycle.

Third, we must educate the world so that we can eliminate superstition, uncontrolled birthrates, and teach all peoples the basic principles of life so that they may strike to become a contributing and useful addition to the global society as a whole.

If these three areas can be completely solved and kept under control, then the human race can once again be ready to progress toward learning as much as it can and to start to explore the ocean, the universe, and the world within ourselves. Each of the problems is solvable. But we must motivate enough concern among all of us so that we as a country and as a planet can devote our energies to ending the turmoil of the current situations. None of these problems can be solved by reverting back: neither back to old solutions, nor to a Neanderthal style of life, nor to tribal communes, nor to a society which does nothing to improve itself. All of these problems can be solved by two existing means: education and technology. By increasing both of these to the largest possible extent, we can go a long way toward reducing and eventually eliminating our current problems.

To attack the first problem, to end war, we are going to have to increase an understanding among all of us that we are all of one race living on one planet. We must comprehend that there is no real difference between blacks, whites, or orientals; no difference between Catholics, Jews, or Protestants, no difference between Chinese, Americans, French, Russians, or Africans. It is only when we realize that mankind is a single unit with no divisions except by those barriers which we have invented in our foolishness, that war among us can begin to subside. The energy which we have needlessly wasted for so long bent on self-destruction if put to the benefit of humanity would be sufficient to solve most if not all of our problems for a very long time.

The second problem, that of recycling waste materials and used products back to reusable substances has already been accomplished to a limited extent. The spacecraft which have been designed to date have gone a long way toward recycling the life supporting elements for the astronauts. Those spacecraft designed for deep space missions now on the drawing board, are expected to be almost totally self-sufficient. When the process reaches an extreme, there will no longer be a waste problem such as there is today. Recycling of all proteins, nutrients, and energy will virtually eliminate much if not all of the current pollution problems.

But the problems can only be attacked by accelerating our present technology to one which takes into account the delicate balances in nature. To do this, the engineers of tomorrow will have to face and eventually overcome the most difficult problems ever to confront man. But it is only through advanced technological methods that we can accomplish this end.

The problems of educating the entire world population is directly related to the problem of ending war by understanding that all men are truly of one species. There is only one feasible way to educate the world's masses. To do this, we must go into space with communication satellites on a scale which has been unequalled in the past. Already the U.S. Space Agency and India have made an agreement to use new communications satellites to reach the inaccessible portions of India, some of which do not even have roads leading to them.

The cost of four color television channels to school children via communication satellites is less than one dollar per pupil per year. Although the educational programs which will be transmitted over this system must be controlled so as not to provide bias

from any one source, the technology to accomplish this form of instant communication throughout the earth is definitely needed if we are to survive as a unit. The education dealt out in the future should teach that all people must regard other humans as fellow earthlings, and the differences in customs, languages, and creeds are intangible.

The 1970's should hold a great period of change for us. Computers can enable us to gain more individuality than has ever before been possible because it is the only type of machine which can deal effectively with so many of us at once. It is the programmers and humans (who have in the past fit us into unnecessary stereotyped categories and have threatened to end our individual identities. We will all be working much more closely with computers in the future, and should become familiar with dealing with them, starting on the secondary school level, as Berwick students have done in past years.

We are all passengers on the spaceship earth. The sooner that all of the world's people and leaders realize that we must work together for the betterment of mankind, the sooner we can realize some of the fantastic achievements that we as a single united race can accomplish. We are heading toward a time when our inventions and machinery will eliminate all of the jobs which are the drudgery and curse of man today. No longer will we need to work every day merely to survive. When that time comes, man will be far from idle. There will be so much for each of us to learn, research, and study, that it will be unlikely that we will ever completely leave educational institutions.

All knowledge is good. Too little knowledge can be dangerous but the more we know about ourselves and the universe, the better off we are and the more we can understand the problems which confront others.

Projects and discoveries made today which may seemingly be of no use as far as we can see may someday become of infinite importance. When we come to the time when work to survive is eliminated, we can best devote our strengths and energy to explore the unknown: to reach out and touch the stars at last. The use of technology as a tool to boldly go forth where none have gone before will feed the romantic, creative, and adventuresome spirit of man for eons. What will be more inspiring than to watch the first martian sunrise? To watch the moons of Jupiter in endless display of eclipse and alignment? To view the glory of Saturn's rings or to discover a way of life on a new and distant planet?

Man has proved to be almost infinitely adaptable. The forms which he will take on on other worlds cannot be imagined or foreseen. But we can always assume a place as the descendants and proponents of whatever man is to become. Now that he has taken his infinitely tiny first step, he has begun the quest of the universe from which there can be no end. Once he has landed upon other planets, has set up colonies and survives comfortably, even the eventual destruction of the Sun cannot terminate the human race. We will keep on existing, exploring, learning, and creating, a task which we were probably placed here to do anyway.

We who are graduating today and all of us who are going to live in this decade and the rest of this century will be entering the most critical time ever in the history of mankind. At no time in the past nor at any point in the distant future will there be a time when more crucial decisions will have to be made by all of us which will determine the very existence of all life as we know it. We must not turn away from technology, which is the only tool we have to get us out of this entanglement, but we must also re-

member that man is an individual being with feelings, emotions, and ideas. Machines should work, people should think.

This new decade is going to be confusing and different to many of us, but the sooner that we are aware of the fact that old solutions are not going to solve new problems, the sooner we can understand each other and comprehend the solutions which are necessary. *I say man will eventually learn, and when he finally does, he will triumph.*

Thank you for listening.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL'S PAUL G. HAYES REPORTS ON THE WORLD ENVIRONMENT

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, as national and international concern with environmental quality has grown, a specialty reporting area in journalism has evolved concurrently: reporting environmental affairs.

Among the best reporters in this relatively new field of journalistic endeavor is Paul G. Hayes of the Milwaukee Journal.

A recent article by Mr. Hayes on the growing environmental threat to the European nations and Japan as it appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on June 14, 1970, follows:

DIRTY OLD WORLD GETS READY TO SCRUB

(By Paul G. Hayes)

The Europe that goes unreported in the travel brochures is the polluted Europe—those rivers that have been converted to sewers and the gases that cut down on the amount of sunshine that warms Paris in the springtime.

Germany, for example, has pollution problems in just the way the United States does. So does Japan. Pollution, in fact, seems the occupational disease of all industrialized, urban, affluent societies at the present stage of technological and social development.

There are some differences. Europeans aren't in the habit of littering, and great care generally is given to the preservation of historic and natural vistas. It is cosmetically, superficially, cleaner.

"In Europe, you almost never see anyone discard anything in the street," commented Richard D. Vaughan, director of the U.S. Bureau of Solid Waste Management, last summer. "In the United States I've seen 'Don't Litter' signs practically covered with litter."

EUROPE'S MESSY PAST

Vaughan's comments went to the heart of a different tradition. There was, in history, the Europe that littered, but that ended with overcrowding and the personal adjustments that were necessary on the part of individuals in densely packed cities.

Furthermore, those cities were huge and densely packed centuries ago. America's large cities are recent arrivals on the landscape, and we haven't, for the most part, made the necessary personal adjustments.

Our throwaway habits were formed partly because the New World appeared virtually limitless to the pioneers. Litter the East, then go West, young man.

Europe's slower awakening to its environmental deterioration might also be explained by the age of its cities. If you raise 10 generations of city folk on the banks of a polluted river, they won't expect that river to

be useful for any purposes other than as a carrier of sewage, and of course, navigation.

On the other hand, the generations that swam or caught sport fish in the Milwaukee River beneath North Ave, still is alive. We have a national memory of the vast worth of clean water in our American cities and we want to return to that condition.

SOME BAD EXAMPLES

The pollution scorecard for industrial Europe and Japan is as full of horrors as the United States' record. Here are some examples gleaned from newspapers and periodicals over a six month period:

Paris has become permanently covered with a layer of gas which has reduced by 25% the strength of the sun's rays.

Last summer, 40 million fish—pollution, tolerant trash fish—died in the Rhine River in Germany, with pesticide poisoning the suspected killer. By the time the Rhine reaches the Dutch coast, 20% of its water is sewage and industrial effluent.

In a recent year, air pollution from steel mills damaged tulip fields in the Netherlands. Tulip growers were paid \$200,000 in damages.

Doctors surveyed residents near a busy Tokyo intersection and found that they carried exceptionally high concentrations of lead from gasoline in their blood and urine.

Salmon shun the Thames River in England, although they once made an annual drive upstream. Now catches of 4 to 5 inch fish from the filthy river warrant comment by London's newspapers.

"No Bathing" signs, because of pollution, are up at beaches between Copenhagen and Elsinore, Denmark, one of Europe's loveliest drives.

Furthermore, the same contradictions that permeate American society are present in Europe. Pollution is deplored at the same time as the causes of pollution are willingly expanded.

A recent newsletter from the Swedish-International Press Bureau told of thermal pollution from nuclear power plants under study outside Stockholm, and new instruments for detecting mercury pollution.

The same issue told about plans to expand the capacity of the Volvo automobile plant at Ghent, Belgium, by some 30,000 cars a year.

Similarly, according to a dispatch from the Associated Press, Rawmarsh, England, is one of 23 places that refuses to enact the provisions of England's clean air act.

In Rawmarsh, every year, 62 tons of soot, grit and sulphur drop from coal smoke onto the town, which is in the heart of Yorkshire's coal mining district. The mayor, if not the residents, doesn't mind.

"There is nothing like a good coal fire," remarked Mayor Ernest Payne, a coal miner for 50 years. "I just do not believe that domestic coal causes damage to health."

To the south, however, conversion from coal burning helped dissipate the London fog, which, in one celebrated case, was fatal to hundreds of Londoners.

Now, more plant varieties can be grown in the gardens of London and the number of species of birds observed within the city has more than doubled in 10 years, to 138.

Japan has built the world's third largest industrial complex on the ruins of World War II, but it did so at a high price. Tokyo's air pollution problem is one of the world's worst.

The number of registered automobiles in Tokyo reached 1,880,000 in 1969 with the result that carbon monoxide levels doubled in two years in one busy section of the city.

"We have come to a point where we have got to choose between economic growth and control of our environment," a Japanese editor said, according to the New York Times. The same story also quoted Dr. Shigeto Tsuru,

professor of economics at Hitotsubashi University:

"Surely we can afford to cut our annual growth rate from 10% down to 5 or 6%, and use the savings to promote environmental controls."

SWEDEN LEADS WAY

Concern about environmental pollution is on the increase in Europe although it does not seem to be accompanied by the fever that marked the days leading to the April "Earth Week" in the United States.

Sweden is leading the way in action. In 1967, the Swedish government brought forth a large package of laws for environmental protection. It was a Swedish resolution that led to plans for a United Nations Human Environment Conference to be held in Stockholm in 1972.

In 1970, environmental concerns have become the "third dimension" of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—after defense (the first dimension) and nonmilitary cooperation (the second).

Last winter, NATO created the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society. As explained by Manlio Brosio, secretary general, the committee will become deeply involved in the issue.

NATO'S FIRST PROJECT

Under a concept of pilot countries in which a single country takes the lead in studies of importance to all members, the committee hopes to develop information and programs of environmental protection.

In January, the NATO council approved the first round of projects. They included, among others, an air pollution project with the US and Turkey as pilots; open water pollution with Belgium, Portugal and France as pilots, and inland water pollution with Canada as pilot.

WILL CONGRESS SAVE THE "DELTA QUEEN"?

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the city of New Orleans is fortunate to lie near the mouth of the greatest navigable waterway in the world, the Mississippi River.

Fifteen hundred miles long, sometimes more than a mile in breadth, this great river was an indispensable factor in the building of our country. It is a rich part of our history, our literature, and our national life.

A century ago, the principal vehicle on the Mississippi was the packet or stern-wheeler. There were hundreds of them, and every young American, including Samuel Clemens, yearned to be a riverboat pilot.

Today only one authentic example of a Mississippi riverboat remains in full operation. The *Delta Queen*, operated by the Greene Line of Cincinnati, is the last of these vessels which contributed so much to the commerce and growth and history of our Nation.

Regrettably, unless Congress acts soon, the *Delta Queen*, the last real packet plying the Mississippi, will have to tie up for the last time.

The plight of the *Delta Queen* and

what Congress can do to save it is ably described in an article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones of the General Features syndicate. I am inserting it in the RECORD, and calling it to the attention of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and to my colleagues in the House:

HISTORIC SHIP ENDANGERED—WILL CONGRESS SAVE THE "DELTA QUEEN"?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Unless Congress does something between now and November 2, the *Delta Queen*, the last real packet on the Mississippi River system, gets the ax from Uncle Sam.

The reason is ridiculous. A government agency has decreed that the "safety-at-sea" regulations, which outlaw any ship carrying more than 50 overnight passengers if it is not built entirely out of steel, must apply to riverboats as well.

For four years the *Delta Queen* has been operating under a temporary congressional reprieve. The *Queen's* hull is steel. But its superstructure, in the tradition of riverboats, is wood. The noble curved staircase is mahogany trimmed with brass. The deck is handpegged ironwood. The 28-foot stern wheel is made of planking, and the cabins are paneled in oak.

The Greene Line of Cincinnati, which sends the *Delta Queen* on cruises down the Ohio and Mississippi and up the Tennessee and Cumberland, had made a valiant effort to meet the government demands.

Only two shipyards even bid on plans for an all-steel, diesel-electric monstrosity. The estimated cost was \$10 million. Not many American river lovers could afford the fares necessary to amortize such an investment.

The safety-at-sea regulations were designed to protect passengers hundreds of miles from land and hours from help. A riverboat runs between river banks. Sure, there's some fire danger in a wooden superstructure. There is also a little danger in stacking up ten 707s over O'Hare on a night when the birds are walking. There's some danger in walking the streets of Washington in daylight.

To knock off the *Delta Queen* because of a law designed for ocean liners would be like pulling down the Tower of London because it doesn't meet city fire escape regulations for public places.

No one would think of allowing passengers to hang on the outside of a New York City bus, but people hang all over San Francisco's wonderful cable cars. If we are going to keep any flavor in America, somewhere there must be an area of common sense.

The *Delta Queen*, as all river buffs know, was not born to the inland rivers at all. She started life in 1926 on the overnight Sacramento-San Francisco run. Still, she looks like a riverboat except to us purists who would prefer the pilot house farther aft behind twin smokestacks abreast. She has a callope, so she's really a hybrid of the *Eclipse* and the *Cotton Blossom*.

The *Delta Queen* goes eight miles an hour. She would drive the jet set bats. In his *Life on the Mississippi* Mark Twain claims that he served a pilot on the John J. Roe, a boat so slow that they changed watches three times in a five-mile stretch. When the boat finally sank, he swore it was five years before the owner heard of it.

Even the *Robert E. Lee*, in its record-breaking 1870 race with the *Natchez*, took three days, 18 hours and 14 minutes to run the 1,218 miles from New Orleans to St. Louis.

The river is not for speed, but for an ex-

perience unlike any other travel adventure. On a boat breasting a stiff current, go-go types glare at the banks and chew their nails. River-lovers are relaxed. Steamboat Capt. Fred Way puts it this way:

"They exist on a continent of their own, secure and steadfast; the boat is stationary; the shores do the moving, advancing, sliding by, retreating. The mountains slide apart and close again. You will wonder as you step ashore, suitcase in hand, whether you are entering the world of reality or departing from it."

I never rode the *Delta Queen*, although I've been aboard her at Cincinnati and New Orleans. But once I helped pilot 600 feet of gasoline barges from Louisville to Baton Rouge, and by the time the five days ended I was a mainline addict.

The Ohio and the Mississippi above Alton are a series of beautiful slack-water lakes divided by dams and locks. But the lower Mississippi is a fractious beast for which charts are useless—gnawing at Tennessee, building up Arkansas, eating islands, piling up reefs, cutting new chutes, leaving isolated oxbows.

Most of the time you float through utter wilderness, for the flood plain between the levees is chancy land, given over to cypress and cottonwood, mysterious pools and Spanish moss. Beyond the levees there may be cities and super roads and locomotive horns and people standing in line. The river hears only the call of the heron, the splash of the muskrat and the gurgle of brown waters around the snag.

We need these things.

God save the *Delta Queen*.

AMERICAN CASUALTY RATES HAVE DECLINED BY 54 PERCENT THIS YEAR

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American casualty rates—both killed and wounded—have declined by 54 percent this year in the Vietnam war.

While any war deaths are too many, nevertheless, the decline this year compared with the first 5 months of last year, is a tribute to the President's efforts to bring about peace.

Pentagon officials say that the decline in casualties is due to having fewer men in combat, progress in the Vietnamization program, and a lower level of enemy action. All three of these reasons can be attributed to the President's policies.

I am sure that the military operation aimed at cleaning out the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia will further reduce those casualties by making it possible to withdraw more Americans and by insuring against a major attack by the enemy as we withdraw.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is becoming ever more clear that the President's policies in Vietnam are the correct ones and deserve the support of all the Members of this Congress.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC'S VIEW OF
THE INDOCHINA WAR

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there have recently come to my attention two fine analyses of American public opinion on the Southeast Asian war. One of these was sent to me by Jack Citrin and Lois Gold of the University of California, Berkeley. The other appear in the June 1970 issue of *Scientific American*. It is written by Philip E. Converse and Howard Schuman. I introduce both into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

"SILENT MAJORITIES" AND THE VIETNAM WAR
(By Philip E. Converse and Howard Schuman)

President Nixon has asserted that a "silent majority" supports his stand on the war in Vietnam. His critics respond that a majority of Americans want a quicker end to the war than the President offers. Each side seems able to cite opinion polls that appear to uphold its point of view. One is left wondering whether or not a national majority has in fact been identified and, if it has, what it favors.

At the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan we have recently brought together a decade of the published results of polls on the Vietnam war. We have also subjected data from our own national surveys to a level of detailed analysis that goes well beyond the usual newspaper reports of public opinion. Although it would be reckless to claim that any simple or unequivocal picture emerges from this work, we can say that our findings do not present the kind of patchwork that defies coherent interpretation. At the very least they help to clarify what is accurate, as opposed to what is probably overdrawn, in either extreme of interpretation of the public mood on the war in Vietnam.

One fact is important to recognize at the outset. Although the standard national survey of some 1,500 interviews may seem far too small to represent a nation with an adult population exceeding 100 million, the procedures of the major reputable survey organizations are geared to mathematical sampling theory and can be expected to provide estimates of overall proportions that are accurate to within a few percentage points. It is true that there are practical problems in applying sampling theory to surveys of human populations, but the problems have to do not with size of sample but with failure to adequately represent all parts of the population. The main loss is unavoidable: some of the people who are selected refuse to be interviewed and others cannot be found during the interviewing period. The proportion missed in this way is often as large as 20 percent and could have serious effects on the results of a poll if such people differed consistently from the rest of the population. Fortunately studies of the characteristics of such "nonrespondents" indicate that omitting them has little effect on the conclusions one would draw about opinion on the Vietnam war. In any event these losses are similar in all surveys of opinion and so cannot serve to explain any seeming difference in the results.

It follows, then, that two national surveys of standard size taken at the same time by competent agencies should show results that differ from each other by no more than a small sampling error. We find this expectation is typically borne out, given one crucial proviso: the questions and the interviewing

procedures must be identical or sufficiently similar. The difficulty is that this condition is met far less frequently than the casual observer might expect.

Where voting behavior is concerned there are not many different ways to assess voter intentions, and election polls can be compared readily. Most matters of public policy are not so easily approached. For the war in Vietnam the controversial aspects are almost innumerable. Each aspect requires a somewhat different question, which has its own unique meaning. Moreover, since polling agencies prefer to word their own questions, it is possible to obtain different results even when two agencies are examining essentially the same aspect of an issue. In the case of the war in Vietnam, for example, it is unusual to find instances where two national surveys were made at the same time with questions worded the same way.

The difficulties that can arise from differing questions are easily demonstrated. In the summer of 1966, for example, 70 percent of the people interviewed by the Gallup poll said they approved the bombing by the U.S. of oil storage dumps in Halphong and Hanol, 11 percent disapproved and the remainder had no opinion. Two months later the same organization sampled opinion about the demand of many "doves" that the U.S. submit the Vietnam problem to the United Nations "and agree to accept the decision, whatever it may be." In this case 51 percent of the sample thought the proposal was "a good idea" and only 32 percent disliked it. The reader who considered this result to be three to two in favor of the doves and compared it with the apparent majority of seven to one for the "hawks" a few weeks earlier might have had cause to wonder about the solidity of public opinion or the soundness of polling procedures. In actuality the confusion lies in too simplistic a view of the results, since the questions were quite different and could not be expected to give commensurate responses.

A more subtle problem is presented when questions identical in purpose differ markedly in wording or format. In June, 1969, the Gallup poll told respondents that the President had "ordered the withdrawal of 25,000 troops from Vietnam in the next three months" and asked for opinions on whether "troops should be withdrawn at a faster or a slower rate." "Faster" won over "Slower" by 42 percent to 16 percent, with 29 percent refusing the alternatives presented and instead spontaneously declaring agreement with the President. Scarcely three months later the Harris poll asked a similar question but presented three choices: "In general, do you feel the pace at which the President is withdrawing troops is too fast, too slow, or about right?" Again the equivalent of "faster" won over "slower," by 29 percent to 6 percent, but this time 49 percent approved the current rate. The key to the difference in the two results is that the Gallup format made it easier for respondents to disagree with the existing rate of withdrawal.

Several approaches are open to the observer who wants to avoid pitfalls of interpretation and make sense of majority opinion on Vietnam. One is to trace changes over a period of time in responses to a question, provided that the fundamental meaning of the question has not been altered by changes in the situation. A second approach is to pay strict attention to nuances in the wording of a number of questions presented at about the same time; in this way one can establish the broad boundaries of public opinion on the war in Vietnam and can isolate the ways that the wording of questions colors responses. A third approach is to explore differing reactions to the same question in various segments of the population.

The broadest trends in American opinion on the Vietnam war over the past decade ap-

pear clearly in all surveys. At the beginning of the period the attitude was one of inattentive tolerance toward the U.S. Government's actions in South Vietnam. For example, when respondents in a Survey Research Center poll in 1960 were asked to name the most important problem facing the country, only a tiny number mentioned the Vietnam war even indirectly. The war received 8 percent of first mentions in 1964, 45 percent in 1966 and 41 percent in 1968. This increased awareness was accompanied, particularly in its later phases, by a progressive disillusionment with the correctness of the U.S. commitment. Such disillusionment is best reflected by data published over a period of time by the Gallup poll.

Although it is clear that the public mood about the Vietnam war is now rather firmly negative, it does not follow that the public reaction to alternatives of policy can be as succinctly characterized. In particular, the simplistic grouping of respondents as hawks and doves breaks down rapidly. Hawks are supposed to believe the U.S. did the right thing in attempting to stem the tide of Communism in Southeast Asia and that the nation should now escalate its military efforts to achieve victory. Doves are supposed to rue the fact that American troops ever became involved in Vietnam and to demand their immediate withdrawal.

Equipped with no more than these definitions, an observer would derive the clear impression from the broad trends reflected by polls that the doves now constitute a majority. Indeed, the Gallup poll showed clearly a shift of doves from a minority to a majority between 1967 and 1969. From time to time the poll asked: "People are called 'hawks' if they want to step up our military effort in Vietnam. They are called 'doves' if they want to reduce our military effort in Vietnam. How would you describe yourself—as a hawk or a dove?"

Other data show that the impression given by these results is quite wide of the mark. A Survey Research Center finding in 1968 is a case in point. Respondents were asked not only if the commitment in Vietnam was a mistake but also which of three courses should be pursued: pulling out, preserving the *status quo* or escalating. As one would expect, there was a tendency for people who thought the intervention was right to favor a stronger stand in the future and for people who deplored the intervention to favor withdrawal. Nonetheless, among those who viewed the war as a mistake almost as many favored escalation as were for withdrawal! All told, then, a five-to-three majority regretted the original intervention, but at the same time those calling for a "stronger stand even if it means invading North Vietnam" outnumbered those advocating complete withdrawal by about as large a margin.

How can the Gallup "dove" majority and the Survey Research Center results be reconciled? Some attention to the wording of the questions is rewarding. The description of "hawk" in the Gallup poll compares reasonably well with the "stronger stand" offered as an alternative by the Survey Research Center, and the proportions endorsing both positions at about the same time show no sharp discrepancy. The description of "dove," however, is more elusive. Whereas it was hardly Administration opinion in 1967, by 1969 even President Nixon was advocating a reduction of the U.S. military effort in Vietnam, thereby qualifying as a "dove" by the Gallup definitions. Nonetheless, his position was plainly different from that of the complete-withdrawal "doves" of the Survey Research Center question.

It is also illuminating to consider the trend of opinion from 1965 through 1969 on the President's handling of the Vietnam situation. The main trend is the sharp decline of confidence in President Johnson's management of the war. One further detail worth attention is the time lag before the decline set

in. The Johnson electoral landslide in 1964 was seen in many quarters as a vote against escalating the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. The bombing of North Vietnam began only three months later, touching off the first highly vocal bitterness on college campuses because it was seen as exactly the policy of escalation just repudiated. Yet the confidence of the broad public in the President's handling of the situation seemed at first to be heightened. It did not begin to turn downward until a full year later. We shall return to this point.

President Nixon appears to have gained in public approval both over his predecessor and during the period since he took office. By last July he had acquired nearly as much support as President Johnson enjoyed in 1965. The President's announcement last November 3 of his plan for a progressive reduction of the nation's military activity in Vietnam appears to have increased his support still more, although this surge now seems to have passed its peak.

Thus at the turn of the year the President stood squarely aligned with several majorities: those regretting American involvement in Vietnam, those wanting to reduce the nation's commitment there and the large majority rejecting complete withdrawal as an alternative. How stable are these majorities? In what direction might they move under various plausible conditions? Any prognoses must rest to an uncomfortable extent on surmise and are subject to reversal by unforeseen events. It is possible, however, to probe somewhat more deeply into the structure of opinion on the Vietnam war in ways that provide further insights.

Among other things, one must consider the plasticity of opinion. It is widely recognized among workers on public opinion that some measured opinion: are much softer, or less crystallized, than others. Soft opinions are likely to change dramatically in response to events, even minor ones, and to the pleas of esteemed leaders.

The evolution of opinion on Vietnam provides instances of the difference between soft and hard opinion. In March, 1968, for example, the Gallup poll noted that "the North Vietnamese have said that if we agree to stop the bombing of North Vietnam, they will agree to peace negotiations" and asked: "Should we stop the bombing or not?" The result was 40 percent for stopping and 51 percent against. Shortly afterward President Johnson announced his decision to stop the bombing, and in April the Gallup poll asked respondents if they approved; 64 percent did and 26 percent did not. It is safe to assume that the shift of some 25 percent in one month was largely due to the President's speech.

On the other hand, one can consider President Johnson's repeated attempts to keep the public believing that the commitment of troops to Vietnam had been necessary. The people accepted this judgment for a while, but events gradually convinced them that the Vietnam war was a mistake. It is likely that the President's later pleas to the contrary damaged his credibility more than it swayed what had become hard opinion.

In general, it is likely that crystallized opinion differs from soft opinion in being anchored more deeply in individual experience, information and motivation. Although there was a time when most Americans lacked enough information about Vietnam to form solid judgments on the nation's involvement there, experience has mounted steeply in terms of deaths, taxes and soldiers not home for Christmas. The end state, a satisfactory disengagement from Vietnam, has come rather clearly into the public's mind. As for the means of reaching that end, opinion is much more tentative. Moreover, there is no reason to believe it will ever become sharply crystallized. To a large

degree the public entrusts officials to make the detailed policy decisions, although it may ultimately punish them at the polls if the selection of means turns out to have been unfortunate.

None of this is to say that all opinions favoring withdrawal or escalation are casual. Many of them are hard, and if the President succeeded in disengagement, there would surely be bitter recriminations from those whose preferences were slighted. Nor are even the deep regrets about the nation's involvement in the Vietnam war immutable. One can imagine circumstances, for instance a southward sweep by Communist China or the collapse of the Vietcong, when such regrets would be swept away as irrelevant. The important point is that if the basic elements of the situation remain as they are, it is likely that a successful disengagement by the President would probably win the strong approval of a vast majority, regardless of the means that might have seemed more sensible along the way.

This interpretation is supported by other observations about polls. People following polls have noted how the support of the President seems to rise after any new initiative, whether it is in the direction of escalation or a reduction of commitment. It is in this light that we interpret the rise in support for President Johnson after his decision to bomb North Vietnam. The support lasted until it became clear that the projected results had been illusory. Similarly, the reaction to President Nixon's speech of last November may chiefly reflect satisfaction that some kind of effort was being made to move the situation off dead center. The entry into Cambodia seemed to be received at first with a parallel surge of public support, in spite of sharp attacks on the policy by leading spokesmen.

What if there is no successful disengagement within a reasonable period of time? If our analysis is correct, we would expect strong public disapproval to set in. It would not be surprising if such a reaction gathered speed more swiftly than the comparable moods during the Korean war and the latter days of the Johnson Administration. In this sense the provisions, timetable laid out in the speech of November 3 is a short fuse on the powder keg, much like the Johnson Administration's statements about having the troops home for Christmas of 1965. There is some evidence, for example, of considerable support for a faster withdrawal of troops than present policy envisions. Moreover, although support for immediate withdrawal has not been large in the past, by early this year there were signs that it might be growing significantly. A definite timetable of a year or so for withdrawal might well be a political platform that could attract widespread support.

It is instructive, in examining the structure of public opinion on Vietnam, to look closely at the segments of the population where support for or resistance to the war is particularly strong. In 1968 the Survey Research Center asked: "How much attention have you been paying to what is going on in Vietnam? A great deal, some, or not much?" When views on the Vietnam war are divided in this way, one finds that the most attentive persons seem to show the firmest support for the war. This relation is most notable in the responses to an additional question on whether or not the original intervention in Vietnam was right. We are aware that self-gauged interest is not necessarily a reliable indicator of how well informed the respondent may be. Nonetheless, the results seem surprising in the light of the association between the concern and the negative feeling about the Vietnam war that has been evident on the campuses of leading universities.

Although attitudes toward the Vietnam war have consistently shown less-distinct differences among various standard groups of the population than is true of many other political attitudes, two exceptions stand out. They are race and sex. Blacks and women have shown more disenchantment with the involvement in Vietnam than white males over the entire period when relevant samplings have been made. The patterns are not surprising. The war in Vietnam has been a notable focus of alienation in the development of black consciousness during the 1960's. Women have traditionally been unenthusiastic about war involvement, and the largest sex differences in responses emerge when policies involving strong military initiatives are at stake. Moreover, blacks and women, for different but obvious reasons, typically show less interest in political affairs than white males do. Therefore some of the association between interest and relatively hard attitudes on Vietnam probably arises from these background differences.

Another pattern, not quite as distinct, is a positive association between education and support for the nation's involvement in Vietnam. Respondents classed as "college-educated" register disproportionately among those who are most "hard-line," or least negative, about the Vietnam war. Here again, since there is typically a fairly strong relation between education and interest in public affairs, one sees a pattern that contributes to the association between attentiveness to the war and support for the nation's involvement.

The surprising feature of the relation between education and attitudes toward Vietnam, however, is that the pattern does not seem to be of a piece with the campus ferment against the war. Moreover, to compound the confusion, national surveys did not yield until recently any distinct relation between age and attitude toward Vietnam. The "generation gap" that one would have expected, wherein the young oppose the war and the old support it, simply failed to appear, and even now it is not very large. Indeed, putting these two findings together, it can be shown with Survey Research Center data as of 1968 that (among whites) college-educated people in their twenties were more likely than older people of grade school education both to justify the war and to favor an intensification of it. The differences are substantial, running to 20 percent or more.

We have subjected the relation between college training and support for the war to closer scrutiny, and the results are highly interesting. An obvious explanation of the seeming paradox is that most of the people who comprise the category of "college-educated" persons in poll results have been out of college for many years. Moreover, the "college-educated" group is a good deal more heterogeneous than one tends to think. It includes, for example, many people who attended a junior college or failed to complete the requirements for a degree at a four-year college.

It is plain that before the entry into Cambodia last month most of the vehement antiwar sentiment had appeared at a fairly small number of campuses usually classed as leading universities. Although these institutions are large and each of them awards many degrees, they are vastly outnumbered by the hundreds of smaller colleges in the nation. As a result, fewer than 25 percent of the college-educated members of the population have ever had contact with a university where the antiwar sentiment has been strong for some time, and for many of those who have had such an affiliation the connection ended long ago.

With these considerations in mind, we have grouped college-educated respondents in Survey Research Center samples according to a general quality rating of the universities they attended. The rating is based on

data concerning faculty salaries and on other information reflecting the academic quality of student bodies. We have also set apart as a separate group the college graduates who did postgraduate work.

Within this framework we have examined the responses to a number of questions, such as the one about whether the respondent favors a stronger stand, preservation of the *status quo* or withdrawal from Vietnam. The reader will recall that responses to this question by the total population inched in a dovish direction between 1964 and 1966 and moved more rapidly in that direction between 1966 and 1968. In each of those years the college-educated group, taken as a whole, was slightly more hawkish than the non-college population. Yet even by 1964 people with graduate training were more dovish than the noncollege group had become by 1968.

More detailed analyses show that women from the "quality" institutions were already quite negative about the war in 1964, although the males from those institutions were at the time thoroughly hawkish. By 1966, however, males with a background in the prominent universities (but without graduate training) had become more resistant than the noncollege population to a hard line in Vietnam.

Throughout the entire period from 1964 to 1968 alumni of the smaller colleges, although they came to see the war as a mistake, clung to a harder line than even the noncollege population. It is this constituency from smaller colleges more than any other that has served as the backbone of popular support for the war. Since this group is numerically the largest in the college-educated population, its views explain why national survey data show people of college background giving relatively strong support to the war. The spread of strong antiwar protest to smaller campuses in recent months, particularly in reaction to the Cambodian campaign, may be a forerunner of broader disillusionment with the war even within the more supportive segments of the public.

In any event these findings suggest rather clearly that feeling against the war has consisted up to now of two currents that are widely separated from each other. One current is made up of a tiny fraction of the population, but one that is highly educated, articulate and visible. The other group tends to be less educated than the national average and is much less politically visible, although it is far larger than the set of vocal critics—perhaps by a factor of 10 or more.

It is likely that the grounds for antiwar sentiment are quite disparate between the two currents. There is of course plain evidence of moral outrage in the more highly educated and articulate group. The polls have made little effort to illuminate the bases of negativism in the broader public, but signs of any moral overtones to this larger discontent are few. General reaction to the reports of the massacre at My Lai, as recorded in a Harris poll in January, can perhaps best be described as bland. Most disenchantment with the war seems pragmatic and can be summed up in the attitude that "we have not won and have little prospect of doing so."

This simple war-weariness has colored poll results for some time. One of the most negative responses to any policy proposal for the Vietnam war appeared when the Gallup poll asked in 1967 about a "suggestion" that "income taxes be raised to help pay for the war in Vietnam": 70 percent of the respondents were opposed. Almost any proposal to share or somehow unload the burden of the war wins strong approval. We have mentioned the positive response to the idea of submitting the issue to the UN. In view of the President's policy of "Vietnamization" it is interesting to note that as early as 1966 the Gallup poll showed 62 percent favoring the transfer of "more responsibility for the fighting of the war" to South Vietnam, with 22

percent opposed and the remainder uncertain. A year later the edge had risen to 77 to 11.

The failure of most commentators to recognize the profound differences between the two currents of opposition to the war may have led to much of the perplexity over the behavior of public opinion. People who oppose the war for moral reasons are little affected by new events that suggest victory or defeat, whereas those who oppose the war for pragmatic reasons are greatly influenced by just such events.

There is much reason to believe the two groups have little communication with each other. The smaller group is in the vanguard of protest against the war, and many of its members are among the militant protesters. The larger group, although it also regrets the war, shares at the same time the antipathy that most Americans have to any political dissent that goes beyond the confines of conventional debate. It is therefore not surprising that when the Survey Research Center asked respondents in 1968 to evaluate a wide range of political leaders and groups on a "feeling" scale, ranging from extremely negative to highly positive, reactions toward "Vietnam war protesters" were by a substantial amount the most negative in the set. Nearly 75 percent of the respondents rated protesters in the negative half of the scale and more than 33 percent placed them at the extreme negative point, which was not otherwise much employed. Indeed, 63 percent of those believing the war was a mistake viewed protesters negatively, and even of the group favoring complete withdrawal from Vietnam, 53 percent put the protesters on the negative side of the scale. Plainly opposition to the war and opposition to active protest against it go together for a significant part of the population.

These findings help to fill in a profile of public opinion on the war in Vietnam. They also lend credence to the proposition that the net effect of vigorous protest in the streets has been to shift mass opinion toward renewed support of the President. On the other hand, the role of highly visible dissent in keeping a wider range of options in the public eye and in encouraging dovish spokesmen in Congress or skeptical commentators in the mass media could be quite real.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC'S VIEW OF THE INDOCHINA WAR

When the contours of public opinion are blurred and hard to establish, the advocates of competing policies often claim majority support and provide statistics from the polls as evidence of such support. So both President Johnson and his critics asserted that theirs was the voice of the majority of the American public; today, President Nixon and his critics are replaying this debate. Careful analysis of a series of polls on the public's attitudes towards the war in Vietnam should settle this dispute, for it tends to these definitive conclusions: 1. The war in Vietnam is extremely unpopular with most Americans and is becoming increasingly so; 2. Any specific proposal that promises a quick end to American military involvement in Indochina will be supported by a majority of the public; 3. This basic opposition to the war in Vietnam is shared by all strata of the population—by the old and the middle-aged as much as by the young, by the rich as much as by the poor, by Republicans as much as by Democrats.

Most Americans believe that the United States should never have become involved in Vietnam in the first place. An October 1969 Gallup poll showed that 58% of a national sample felt that the United States had made a mistake in sending troops to fight in Vietnam, while only 32% felt that sending troops had been the right decision. These figures represent the culmination of a steady, continuous trend in increasing opposition to the war, for in August 1965 only 24% of the

public thought it had been a mistake to send American troops to fight in Vietnam, while 61% thought this the right decision. A December 1969 Harris poll reports even more impressive evidence of current opposition to the war in Vietnam. This poll showed that 52% of the American public agreed that "Anti-war demonstrators are right in saying the war is morally indefensible and it was a big mistake for the U.S. to be there." Only 37% disagreed with this statement, despite its reference to the often maligned and officially condemned antiwar demonstrators.

There has been a decisive shift in American public opinion towards opposition to American involvement in Vietnam and towards support for deescalation of the conflict. Furthermore, this shift in public attitude has been accompanied by increasing public concern about and knowledge of the Indochinese conflict. In other words, opposition to the war has increased as public awareness has grown and ignorance declined. A November 1969 Gallup poll showed that 55% of the American public preferred to describe themselves as "doves, favoring a policy of reducing our military effort in Vietnam" rather than "hawks, who favor stepping up our military effort in Vietnam". 31% did choose to describe themselves as "hawks," but as late as February 1968, the corresponding proportions had been only 24% "doves" and 60% "hawks." Similarly, while in February 1968 70% of the public felt that continuing the bombing of North Vietnam would improve the chances for meaningful peace talks, by March 1970 two-thirds of the public opposed a resumption of American bombing of North Vietnam despite the stalemate of the peace talks. Finally, support for the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam is also growing. In November 1969 only 21% of the American people opted for this most radical of "dove" positions, but by February 1970 fully 35% of the public were willing to endorse it.

As is well-known, a variety of Vietnam peace plans have been proposed, by Senators, Congressmen, and others. Whenever asked, the public has indicated majority support for any proposal that refers to a relatively quick, definite end to American military involvement in Indochina. The overwhelming majority of the American public have consistently favored proposals to minimize the combat responsibilities of American troops and to turn over more of the fighting to the South Vietnamese armed forces. As early as 1967, 61% of the public approved a plan that would give the South Vietnamese twelve months to build up and train their armed forces to take over all ground combat responsibilities from American troops. In the same year, a poll conducted by the National Opinion Research Center found that 88% of the public were willing to support negotiations with the Viet Cong, 54% supported free elections in South Vietnam even if it seemed the Viet Cong would win, and 52% were willing to support the formation of a coalition government in South Vietnam that included the Viet Cong. More recently, in October 1969, 56% of a national sample favored and only 30% opposed Senator Goodell's proposal that Congress pass legislation requiring the withdrawal of ALL United States troops from Vietnam by the end of 1970. In March 1970, approximately 50% of the public favored withdrawing all troops immediately or at least within eighteen months. Only 7% favored stepping up the fighting in Southeast Asia, a policy embodied for the short-run at least, in the President's Cambodian decision. Finally, a number of polls taken in California since American troops were ordered into Cambodia reveal continuing support for any and all peace proposals, provided they omit direct reference to an American defeat in Vietnam, 67% of an Alameda County sample, for example, supported a proposal calling for the United States to declare that it would cease firing

in Vietnam immediately and prepare for the election of a new government in South Vietnam.

These results indicate a basic inconsistency of public purpose and not, as some have argued, confusion or illogical thinking. The American public wants to end the war in Vietnam as soon as possible. There is, as one might expect, considerable sympathy for American soldiers forced to fight overseas, but there is very little commitment to the view that the policy of fighting in South Vietnam is worthwhile or even necessary. Whenever the public is offered a proposal that calls for setting an early deadline to United States participation in the war, a majority supports that proposal regardless of whether or not such approval might be partially inconsistent with support of some other proposal similar in intent.

It is important to note that every stratum of the population shares this general outlook. To be sure, women are slightly more likely to oppose American involvement than are men, and blacks are somewhat more opposed than whites, but the differences between different segments of the population are not great. For example, 59% of the women and 54% of the men polled favored passage of Senator Goodell's proposal to withdraw all American troops by the end of 1970. 55% of those with professional or business occupations approved of this proposal, as did 59% of the manual workers polled. Of those under 39, 58% approved but so did 56% of those over 30. In fact, the young have never been more likely than those over 30 to consider the involvement of the United States in Vietnam a mistake. It is true that the youthful dissenters to the war in Vietnam have tended to be more articulate and vocal in their opposition, more likely to participate in organized demonstrations against the war. This youthful support for the goals of the activist opponents of the war has been growing, but as late as November 1969 relatively more citizens over 30 than those under 30 felt that the war was a mistake. So it is a mistake to view opposition to the war as the province of the youthful few. On the contrary, the public opinion polls repeatedly demonstrate that antipathy toward American involvement in Vietnam is widespread and not confined to any particular segment of the population.

Moreover, the widespread and growing opposition to the war in Vietnam among the general public is paralleled by the attitudes of many leading businessmen, academics, and public officials. The remarks of Mr. Louis B. Lundborg, Chairman of the Board of the Bank of America, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 15, 1970, are worth noting. Mr. Lundborg said:

"In my judgment the war in Vietnam is a tragic national mistake. No matter who initiated the first involvement or subsequent expansions, the rest of us have gone along pretty supinely. If anyone is to blame, it is people like me for not speaking up and speaking out sooner. In my judgment it is time for the shareholders of America . . . the people . . . to begin to call for an end to the squandering of American blood, morale and resources on what is in essence an Asian war of nationalism."

Mr. Lundborg, Mr. Thomas Watson, Chairman of IBM, and other leading businessmen have also provided detailed evidence that the war in Vietnam has had disastrous consequences for the health of the economy. Small wonder then that Clark Clifford, former Secretary of Defense, could describe President Nixon's decision to send troops into Cambodia and expand the war as "reckless."

How, in the face of all this, can President Nixon claim that his policies have the support of the majority of the American people, of the increasingly less silent "silent majority." In support of his claim the President

can point to public approval of the Vietnamization program. But this policy, designed to turn over the fighting in South Vietnam to South Vietnamese had the support of the public long before Mr. Nixon was elected President. It is approved by the public because it is seen as a means toward the quickest possible end of American involvement in the fighting. The President has also pointed to the results of polls showing that the majority of the public "approves of the way President Nixon is handling the situation in Vietnam." But this question is an inappropriate measure of support for a public policy, for it also taps generalized support for a public institution, the Presidency, partisan affiliation and/or attachment to the incumbent President for whom many respondents had voted. Even on this impure measure support for the Administration's policy has been declining and in April 1970 only 48% approved while 41% disapproved.

An examination of the public's view of the decision to invade Cambodia with American troops clarifies this issue. Shortly after the decision was made, a Gallup poll reported that 51% approved of the way in which President Nixon was handling the Cambodia situation. But when the public was asked whether they approved of "sending American troops to help Cambodia", a question that does not mention President Nixon, only 28% approved and 60% were opposed. In addition, the public was pessimistic about the outcome of the Cambodia invasion; less than a third believed that a major involvement there could be avoided and few shared the President's expectations for the results of his decision.

Moreover, even the most promising, (from the President's point of view) interpretation of this poll is unwarranted. Political scientists have identified a "rallying-around-the-flag" phenomenon which consists of large accretions of public support for and approval of the President in any major crisis. This phenomenon is the result of many citizens, sometimes as many as 15% of the general public, identifying themselves in times of crisis with a President they might otherwise oppose. This rallying of support typically occurs regardless of whether a President's actions prove successful, as in the case of the Cuban missile crisis, or disastrous, as in the case of the Bay of Pigs. The negligible increase in public approval of President Nixon after his critical Cambodian decision suggests either that he could not convince many of us to rally to his side or that his 51% approval rate includes some who have rallied to his side and therefore that his stable supporters are less than a majority of the people.

Other polls that asked for the public's response to the Cambodian decision confirm these conclusions. A number of polls in Northern California consistently showed about 60% opposed to the invasion of Cambodia. A nationwide telephone survey conducted by the Sindlinger Research Co. immediately after the President's decision showed only 33% supporting the President's move, with the rest either opposed or undecided. By the time the Harris poll of late May was conducted, there were few who remained undecided. Barely 50% approved of "President Nixon ordering troops into Cambodia" while 43% had serious doubts. In this instances, there were divisions between young and old, men and women, urban residents and rural dwellers, but these differences reflect, in the main, divergences in generalized approval of President Nixon. This same Harris poll indicated widespread skepticism about the President's public avowals and pledges. Most people (49% to 38%) did not believe that the President would make good on his promise to bring home 150,000 more combat troops by May, 1971; 56% envisioned U.S. fighting men in Cambodia six months from now; and most believed that the Cambodian invasion would widen the

war into all of IndoChina rather than shorten the present conflict in Vietnam.

All of the evidence confirms our basic conclusions. The war in Vietnam is unpopular; official pronouncements of military success are not trusted; all proposals for a quick end to American involvement by withdrawing troops and deescalating the fighting win public approval. The public is anxious to support American fighting men; they would like to avoid the impression of an American defeat in Vietnam. But the overwhelming image is one of fatigue, frustration, and growing anger over a war that has long been considered a tragic blunder.

What support the President can muster for policies that are not policies of deescalation and withdrawal comes in large part from public backing for the Presidency as an institution. Nevertheless, such support is weakening and the evidence from public attitudes towards previous wars and earlier Presidents indicates that it will continue to diminish. The war in Vietnam has already cost America much. The country has lost many men, much material. The war has damaged the economy and sown intense divisions among us. It is increasingly obvious that the continuing American involvement in Vietnam has strengthened the advocates of isolationism and reduced the public's willingness to actively aid such countries as Israel whose democratic character cannot be questioned. The most serious long-term cost, however, is the erosion of respect for public institutions, a weakening of the legitimacy of the American system of government. By tying the Presidency too long to an unpopular, divisive and costly policy, Mr. Nixon is risking the public's respect and affection for the Presidency. In a democracy, major policies require the consent of a large majority of the people if they are to be sustained. The war in Vietnam and the invasion of Cambodia do not have this public backing; to persist in the Administration's current course is to risk the capacity of any future administration to govern effectively in a democratic fashion.

MINNESOTA STUDENT'S POEM UPLIFTS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Jane Plumhoff of St. James, Minn., a young lady in my congressional district, recently won second place in the grades four to six division of the State poetry contest sponsored by the Catholic Daughters of America in Minnesota. Jane is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Don Plumhoff of St. James, and a student at St. James Catholic school.

Certainly, with all the commotion that is going on in the world today, I found it very refreshing to read the beautiful sentiment expressed in Jane's little poem, which is called "God's Creation." I would like to share it with my colleagues:

God's CREATION

(By Jane Plumhoff)

God made the stars, the sky, the moon,
He made the caterpillar, with its cocoon;
God made the fish, the flower, the trees,
He made the beautiful buzzing bees.
God made the rivers, lakes, and streams,
The big hot sun with its golden beams.
Above all these and more grand,
Is God's creation of man.

ESCALATION FEARED: WASHINGTON ORDERED NOT TO CROSS THE DELAWARE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis News recently ran what they said was a letter from the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Continental Congress to Gen. George Washington, urging that he not cross the Delaware River and expand the Revolutionary War into New Jersey. Although the letter is obviously tongue in cheek, there is a message in it for those hand-wringers who have been upset by our defensive actions in Cambodia. It is for these people that I insert the item into the RECORD:

ESCALATION FEARED: WASHINGTON ORDERED NOT TO CROSS THE DELAWARE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter from the Continental Congress to Gen. Washington was recently discovered by the research staff of the Stephen Decatur Society.)

DECEMBER 12, 1776.

DEAR GENERAL WASHINGTON: Word has been received by the Continental Congress which has caused grave concern. We are informed that you are planning an expansion of the conflict into New Jersey. Rumor has it that you intend to cross the Delaware River and attack the enemy at Trenton.

You are advised that Congress has passed a resolution forbidding you from such a reckless adventure. You must be aware that a large percentage of our citizens do not favor your military approach to this war. Furthermore, you have already announced a major withdrawal of combat troops since the enlistment of about three-fourths of your 6,000 troops expires on Dec. 31. It seems highly unreasonable to expect these troops to re-enter New Jersey less than 10 days prior to expiration of their enlistments.

It is the sentiment of the Congress that your pitiable supplies should be preserved and not expended on a maneuver of such debatable value. What can you possibly hope to accomplish? The British command the seas and will have no difficulty resupplying what little military equipment you may be able to destroy or capture.

We must also advise that should you disobey this command and attack Trenton, that all further monies and supplies will be stopped immediately. While we regret the inconvenience this may cause your army, we feel that control of the purse strings is the only effective tool which we have to force you to limit your ambitious programs.

We are further shocked that you should anticipate launching a surprise attack on Christmas Eve. This is traditionally a festive occasion on which it may be reasonably anticipated the British Army is not expecting to engage in combat. Perhaps this situation might be slightly altered if you had received a formal invitation from the duly constituted government of the colony of New Jersey to engage in such conduct. But we find nothing in the files of the Continental Congress's Committee on Foreign Affairs to indicate such an invitation.

We understand you have promised to leave New Jersey immediately following the Trenton operation. But how can we believe you? You have 4,500 militiamen who expect to be discharged on Dec. 31. What assurance do we have that you will not keep them in Trenton under some pretext of military necessity? How can we trust you? We relied on your leadership at Long Island, Trog's Neck, Pel-

ham and White Plains and each time you lost. Now you say that this sneak attack on Trenton is not only militarily sound but might be the turning point in the war.

Finally, your proposed attack will only harden the attitude of King George III. Although we admit that for 10 years negotiations with King George have had no success beyond agreement on the shape of the conference table, still we must persist in seeking a political settlement. He may become even more intransigent when word of your affront reaches London.

After all, we really have no vital interest to protect in New Jersey. The Revolution can be won without New Jersey. Maybe you can win this war by catching Gen. Cornwallis at Yorktown in Virginia. Although this is admittedly speculation, under such a circumstance we could get along without retaking New Jersey.

In summary, Gen. Washington, you are hereby ordered to keep your troops on the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware until the Continental Congress's Foreign Affairs Committee decides to let you cross and, oh yes, be sure to have the Revolution terminated no later than Dec. 31, 1777.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRUTAL INVASION AND FORCIBLE OCCUPATION OF BALTIC NATIONS

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 30th anniversary of the brutal invasion and forcible occupation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the predatory forces of the Soviet Army. For we who take freedom for granted, it is almost impossible to believe that the valiant peoples of these three Baltic nations have been suffering under Communist slavery for nearly half the allotted lifetime of the average person.

Following annexation by the Russians in June 1940, hundreds of thousands of Balts were forcibly exiled, banished to inhuman Siberian prison camps, and executed. Since June 15, 1940, these three countries have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population.

Throughout these years of enslavement, the brave Baltic people have waged a gallant fight for freedom. Between 1940-52, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. After cessation of guerrilla warfare in 1952, they resorted to passive resistance.

Despite massive efforts, the Soviet tyrants have never succeeded in smothering the flame of freedom that burns in the hearts of these noble and valiant people. They remain loyal to their national integrity, steadfast in their love for their native land, and devoted to personal and political liberty.

The heroic Baltic peoples know the fragility of freedom and the terror of tyranny. Their pleas for freedom will not be stilled. We share their fervent hope and prayer that these years of suffering will soon end, and democratic government will be restored to their lands.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD today for distribution to my constituents the tally of my recent questionnaire and the list of public bills I have sponsored in the 91st Congress:

BOW BILLS—91ST CONGRESS TO JUNE 15, 1970

H.R. 15—To permit development of SST with private investment only.

H.R. 165—Provide equity in immigration policy for Irish citizens.

H.R. 3330—Import quotas on steel and steel products.

H.R. 3855—Provide for new Hoover-type Commission for government.

H.R. 8652—Establish Commission on Revision of Anti-Trust Laws.

H.R. 8921—Establish additional National Cemetery to supplement Arlington.

H.R. 9244—Provide automatic cost-of-living increases for Social Security.

H.R. 9409—Expedite customs entry of private aircraft.

H.R. 10001—Establish National Armed Forces Historical Museum Park and Study Center in connection with Smithsonian Institution.

H.R. 10002—Revise police pay scale.

H.R. 11031—Prohibit use of mails to send obscene literature to minors.

H.R. 11032—Prohibit interstate shipment of obscene materials.

H.R. 11751—Reform the postal service.

H.R. 11975—National charter for United Daughters Civil War.

H.R. 12440—Increase production of timber.

H.R. 13983—Federal revenue sharing plan to aid State and local governments.

H.R. 14174—Welfare reform.

H.R. 14490—Release supply of nickel from stockpile.

H.R. 15420—Additions to the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

H.R. 15425—Provide new program for expansion of American Merchant Marine.

H.R. 15429—Site for Smithsonian National Museum of Man.

H.R. 16038—Provide additional park and recreation areas nationwide.

H.R. 16039—Improve solid waste disposal and research.

H.R. 16040—Extend and strengthen the Clean Air Act.

H.R. 16041—Establish Environmental Financing Authority.

H.R. 16042—Increase funds for local waste treatment grants.

H.R. 16699—Strengthen laws regarding bombings, etc.

H.R. 16943—Strengthen U.S. international trade program.

H.J. Res. 306—Constitutional Amendment, Equal Rights for Women.

H.R. 17973—Expansion of trade.

H.R. 17974—Expansion of trade.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN FRANK T. BOW WOULD LIKE YOUR OPINION

DEAR FRIENDS: What promises to be a productive session of Congress is now preparing for votes on issues that will reshape the structure of our Federal Government in its relations with the states, cities and individual citizens. I seek your opinions and evaluation of some of these issues.

In some other years there has been criticism of Congressional questionnaires, not only my own, but those of other Members of Congress, based on the presentation of the issues. Some citizens have complained that

more background and explanation should be included with the question, so that an individual who is not up-to-date on various proposals will have a basis of fact upon which to make a decision. Space does not permit detailed discussions of each of the issues, but I have endeavored to introduce a new format with this questionnaire, giving at least the outline of the issue at stake and some of the alternatives.

You will note that this form does not require an envelope for its return. Simply fold it so that my address is on the outside, affix a six cent stamp and put it in the mail.

In other years a great many people have stapled, glued or scotch-taped the question-

naire closed, apparently with the intent of keeping its contents confidential. This has meant hundreds of extra hours of labor to open and count the polls. I think it is quite reasonable to assume that no one in the mail service has time to open and read your comments. Confidentiality is assured without stapling or sealing. My small staff has its hands full keeping up with our daily work and when questionnaires come back by the mail sackfull, time in opening them must be held down.

Please feel free to call or write me whenever I can be of assistance with any Federal Government problem. Our new offices in the Citizens Savings Building on Central Plaza in Canton is open daily and the phone number

there is 456-2896. The Washington phone number is area code 202-225-3876. The daily work of the Appropriations Committee and House debate may make it difficult to reach me personally by phone, so please feel free to state the nature of your problem or inquiry and you will be referred to the staff member who is expert in that particular field.

The largest possible return of these questionnaires will help me to represent your point of view on the issues of the day. I appreciate your willingness to take time to answer the question and return the form to me.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

TALLY OF FRANK T. BOW'S 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

Percent		Percent	
1. Reform of the welfare system is being considered in Congress where most people agree that the present system after 30 years is a failure. It has not encouraged people to find work, it has contributed to the breakdown of family life, and it has created a growing group of persons who have no other way of life. Please check which of the following alternatives you favor (check only 1):		3. Congress has for consideration the report of the Presidential Commission recommending establishment of a volunteer Army and abolition of the draft. Please indicate your preference among the following alternatives (check 1):	
(a) President Nixon has proposed a "basic minimum Federal payment" of \$500 for each adult and \$300 for each child in a family per year, a total of \$1,600 for a family of 4, with the provision that the able-bodied head of the family accept either training for a job or a job if available. The plan would encourage families to improve themselves by working, continuing a portion of the Federal payment until total work and "workfare" payments totaled \$3,920 for the family of 4. This would be done by permitting the family to retain \$60 weekly in earnings and reducing the "workfare" payment by 50 cents for each \$1 earned above that amount.	77	(a) An all-volunteer Army with increased pay and other incentives for career service, placing the draft on a standby basis for all-out war only	56
(b) Substantially the same proposal put forth by the Democratic Policy Council which would provide the family of 4 a basic \$3,600 (instead of \$1,600) with \$6,100 as the cutoff.	14	(b) A new system of national military service under which every able-bodied man would be required to serve a minimum tour of duty for training with incentives for career service	22
(c) Other changes in the present system (specify)	10	(c) A new system of national service under which both young men and young women would be required to serve the Nation for a period of time, either military or nonmilitary	15
2. On Aug. 15, 1969, President Nixon began the withdrawal of American combat forces from Vietnam. Since that date Vietnamese forces have been trained to take over many areas of the fighting and several large bases and naval forces have been turned over to Vietnam. By Apr. 15, 1970, 115,000 American combat troops will have returned to the United States and total troop strength will be 434,000 compared with 550,000 last August. Future rate of withdrawal is dependent upon success of Vietnamization of the war effort, enemy response, progress of peace negotiations, safety of American forces that will remain. Please indicate the alternative you prefer:		(d) Continuation of the present system	5
(a) Continuation of the Nixon program described above, assuming withdrawal will continue as planned.	56	(e) Other (specify)	2
(b) Withdrawal of all U.S. forces by September 1971, as proposed recently by the Democratic Policy Council.	16	4. Inflation and the rising cost of living continue to be major issue. To control inflation please indicate which of the following will be helpful. (Check more than 1 if you wish):	
(c) Similar withdrawal by Jan. 1, 1971, as proposed by Senator Goodell and others.	15	(a) Continued efforts to reduce Federal spending and balance the Federal budget without additional taxes	53
(d) Other (specify)	13	(b) Federal control of wages and prices	32
		(c) Continued Federal Reserve Board restrictions on the money supply	10
		(d) Other (specify)	5
		5. There is increasing evidence of need for new labor-management relations law to help prevent or settle nationwide strikes that injure the economy. President Johnson promised such a proposal in 1967 but was not able to produce one. Among alternatives suggested are:	
		(a) Referral of best offer of both sides to impartial panel which would set terms.	55
		(b) An "economic strike" during which labor would work for statutory minimum wage, management would be fined amount equal to total loss of earnings of labor, sums lost by workers and paid by management would go into trust fund and would be returnable to each on a decreasing scale as strike continued (90 percent 1st week, 80 percent 2d, etc.). Meanwhile, there could be neither a walkout nor a lockout	22
		(c) Referral to a new National Labor Court empowered to consider the merits and impose settlements	13
		(d) Other (specify)	10

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ASK WHETHER YOU FAVOR OR OPPOSE EACH OF SEVERAL PROVISIONS IN PENDING LEGISLATION

	Percent			Percent	
	Favor	Oppose		Favor	Oppose
6. President Nixon has sent Congress a 37-point environmental quality program which includes the following major provisions:			(b) Increasing the maximum wage base on which social security tax is withheld from \$7,800 to \$9,000	48	52
(a) Federal matching funds at the rate of \$1,000,000,000 yearly to assist communities (or regional areas) in construction of sewage treatment facilities—total cost \$10,000,000,000 in 5 years	74	26	(c) Eliminate earnings as part of the retirement test (remove earnings limitation)	62	38
(b) A Federal Environmental Financing Authority to assure purchase of local bond issues for this work at a reasonable rate if private markets cannot absorb bonds	68	32	(d) Retain earnings limit but raise it automatically as general wage levels rise	60	40
(c) Full appropriation of \$371,000,000 in 1971 and similar amounts in succeeding years for acquisition and development of Federal, State, local parks and recreation areas	63	37	8. The President has recommended and the Senate has passed a drug control program including the following provisions:		
(d) Utilization, including donation to local governments, of surplus Federal lands for park and recreational purposes	84	16	(a) Increasing penalties for the manufacture or sale of narcotics, including marihuana and hallucinatory drugs, by professional criminals (the "pushers"). Present penalty for 1st offense is 5 to 20 years and fine up to \$20,000. New penalty would be 5 years to life imprisonment and fine up to \$50,000	95	5
(e) Federal rather than State quality standards for air and water	81	19	(b) Reducing penalties for casual use or possession of same. Present penalties are the same as for hardened criminals, 5 to 20 years and \$20,000. New penalty for a 1st offense would be imprisonment up to 1 year and fine up to \$5,000	60	40
(f) Penalties up to \$10,000 per day for violation of air and water quality standards	86	14	(c) A "no-knock" warrant which could be issued by a court to police in a drug case. The warrant would permit the officers to enter a premises without warning. It could be issued only after the court had evidence that the incriminating evidence would be destroyed if the police gave warning of their visit	89	11
(g) Increasingly strict control of auto exhaust emission and development of Federal standards and control of fuel and fuel additives	92	8	(d) Establishment of a Committee on Marihuana to make the 1st in-depth study on this subject	65	35
7. The House of Representatives will soon consider amendments to the social security program including the following:					
(a) Placing all future social security benefit increases on an automatic basis so that an increase in benefits will follow closely upon increase in cost of living	82	18			

AMBASSADOR MOSBACHER GETS SPORTSMAN'S AWARD

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, America is fortunate to have as its chief of protocol one of its most able and distinguished citizens. Ambassador Emil

Mosbacher, Jr., most often accompanied by his gracious and lovely wife, Pat, is the first American to welcome officially, foreign visitors to our shores. He does so with a warmth and directness which reinforce a commitment to make their stay here both comfortable and reflective of the America way of life.

Many foreign officials have written to the Department of State to compliment Ambassador Mosbacher on the services rendered during their visits to this Nation. In addition, many distinguished

American leaders, including President Nixon and Vice President AGNEW, have recognized the important contribution that "Bus" is making to American diplomacy and statesmanship.

I think the Members will be interested in reading some of these letters, and I am including a sample in the RECORD at this point:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"The decision of community leaders across the Nation to present this year's Colonel

Eagan Sportsman's Award to Ambassador Emil Mosbacher, Jr., is most appropriate. For "Bus" Mosbacher follows in a distinguished line of outstanding sportsmen who have also given notable service to their communities and their country.

"As Chief of Protocol, Bus Mosbacher has displayed the same sense of precision, command, and grace under pressure that characterized his performance as a yachtsman. I am proud that he is now a "member of our crew"—and this his accomplishments are being recognized by you tonight. And I am especially happy that you are helping to further the fine work of the People-to-People Sports Committee. As Bus Mosbacher has amply proven, sportsmen are often our country's best ambassadors of good will."—RICHARD NIXON.

"The support which your office furnished during my Asian trip was efficiently rendered and very much appreciated. . . . My thanks to you and to all your people for a job well done."—SPIRO T. AGNEW.

"May I also say how grateful I was during my visit to Washington for all your kindness and help."—PRIME MINISTER HAROLD WILSON.

"I have seen you in action in the State Department and in the White House and recently in the United Nations and you have given the Protocol Office of your government a new dignity which has won the respect and admiration of the friends and allies of your government."—CARLOS P. ROMULO, *The Secretary of Foreign Affairs, The Philippines*.

"It was one of the delights of our visit to meet you and your lovely wife. I can't honestly say that I ever had any doubts about the good judgment of the President and Mr. Rogers. But if I had entertained any they would have been dispelled by the consciousness that you and she had been specially chosen by them.

"I want to convey to you again, and to Mrs. Mosbacher, the deep appreciation of Mrs. Holyoake and myself for your gracious hospitality and assistance during our visit to Washington. That we found our stay immensely enjoyable, as well as profitable, was in considerable part due to your attention and kindness."—KEITH HOLYOAKE, *Prime Minister of New Zealand*.

"The Duchess and I want to thank you and Mrs. Mosbacher for all the good care you took of us during our recent visit to Washington for the President and Mrs. Nixon's dinner party at the White House.

"It was a most memorable occasion and it was very gracious of the Nixons to have paid us the compliment of inviting us."—EDWARD, *Duke of Windsor*.

"Prime Minister Sato, who left the United States feeling quite satisfied with the result of his recent talks with President Nixon, was deeply appreciative of your great assistance and thoughtful arrangements which made his visit to this country a most pleasant and constructive one."—TAKESO SHIMODA, *Ambassador of Japan*.

"Yesterday was a memorable day for all of us who were privileged to witness the moon shot in Florida. . . . Our enjoyment of this historic occasion was increased by the most efficient and hospitable way in which you and your colleagues looked after your guests. You could not have been more considerate and we could not have been more comfortable."—A. E. RITCHIE, *Ambassador of Canada*.

"Before leaving for home, I should like to express to you my sincere gratitude for the courtesy and hospitality extended to me throughout my stay in the United States.

"As I leave, I carry with me fond memories of a most delightful visit, and I know that this has been made possible in a good measure by you and your diligent aides who

spared no effort to make my stay comfortable and happy."—MRS. GOLDA MEIR, *The Prime Minister of Israel*.

"Please accept my sincere gratitude for your kind attentions and your constant and helpful presence during the Presidential visit last week. Undoubtedly your assistance contributed to the brilliance and success of our mission to your great country."—ARISTIDES CALVANI, *Foreign Minister of Colombia*.

"May I take this opportunity to thank you very much for the great work the State Department has done to make the visit of Chancellor Willy Brandt in Washington a success. In more than twenty years of my diplomatic service I have never experienced a Protocol helping an Embassy more polite and friendly and more effectively than the Protocol of the State Department under Mr. Mosbacher. We appreciate this with great satisfaction and gratitude."—ROLF PAULS, *Ambassador of Germany*.

"I wish to take this opportunity to extend to you my deepest and heartfelt thanks for your wonderful cooperation, as well as the excellent arrangements which were made in connection with the visit of my August Sovereign, His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah Aryamehr to Washington.

"The assistance and kindness extended by you and all your colleagues at the State Department were invaluable and highly appreciated."—DR. A. ASLAN AFSHAR, *Ambassador of Iran*.

"Before leaving for Tunisia—upon termination of my mission to your great country—I would like to extend to you my personal thanks for your courteous cooperation and to your department and its most able staff for the outstanding assistance given to me at all times in fulfilling my duties as Ambassador to the United States of America."—RACHID DRISS, *Ambassador of Tunisia (former)*.

"Last Friday I made my diplomatic call on H.R.H. Prince Juan Carlos. He mentioned the high regard he holds for you. I got the feeling that the cordial reception he gave me, and the esteem he has for our country, were due in large measure to his personal friendship for you."—ROBERT C. HILL, *U.S. Ambassador to Spain*.

"On behalf of President Llera, his official party and on my own behalf, I wish to renew to you our deep gratitude for all your courtesies and valuable assistance during the visit to Washington and New York of our Chief of State.

"The many kindnesses we received from you and Mrs. Mosbacher went so far beyond the customary official courtesies, that they call forth our warmest feelings of appreciation and friendship."—MISAEEL PASTRANA, *former Ambassador of Venezuela*.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

INFLATION CURE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, O. Yale Lewis, Jr., a young attorney who is presently a law clerk to U.S. District Judge Alfred T. Goodwin, Portland, Oreg., who graduated from Harvard in economics and in law from the University of Virginia, has prepared a very persuasive analysis of our present economic situation, with his recommendations for action.

Because of the interest it may have for both the administration and my colleagues and because of my conviction that more aggressive action is necessary in the economic area, I am offering it herewith for the RECORD:

THE CASE FOR CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS AND LESS RESTRICTIVE MONETARY POLICIES

(By O. Yale Lewis, Jr.)

Because of the administration's misplaced hope that a balanced budget and "moderately" restrictive monetary policies will stop inflation, many Americans are suffering from both a rising cost of living and excessive unemployment. Moreover, because a "moderately" restricted money supply and "moderately" expensive credit will not stop inflation, inflation and rising unemployment will continue under present policies either until credit becomes so scarce that a severe economic recession produces enough unemployment to create deflation or until Congress or the President develops a better way to control inflation.

Price and wage controls are one possible way to stop inflation. However, price and wage controls disrupt the normal processes of the market economy and of collective bargaining, and do not correct the underlying causes of inflation. Therefore, they should be resorted to only when there is no alternative.

Reducing consumer purchasing power will also stop inflation. Two means of accomplishing the reduction are: (1) increasing personal income taxes; and (2) limiting the amount of credit available for consumer purchases. Increased taxes have already been attempted to a limited extent in conjunction with expensive credit. The results have not been encouraging. Additional increases in personal income taxes have been rejected by the Congress and, apparently, by the President. Now consumer credit controls must be considered.

Expensive credit is not halting inflation, because it has too little direct effect on consumer demand. Consumers are more concerned with the size of down payments and monthly payments than they are with finance charges. Consequently, high interest rates alone do not significantly impede installment sales. Similarly, higher prices have little effect on consumer purchasing, unless, as in housing and automobiles, the increase in total price becomes so large that down payments and monthly payments are increased significantly.

A contributing factor in the continuing flow of consumer credit is the banks' preference for retail contract paper. There are state statutory limits on maximum interest rates which banks and other lending institutions may charge on business and personal loans. In most states, the maximum annual interest rate on personal loans is 8% to 10%; on business loans 10% to 12%. However, in

many states there is no limit on the service charge which may be charged by retailers on installment contract sales and on outstanding balances on charge accounts. The current rate in most instances is an annual 18%. Banks buy these installment contracts and retail accounts receivable at approximately face value, discounted for the statistical probability of default.

Since banks can realize such a substantially greater return on this type of commercial transaction than is possible on personal and business loans, it is to be expected that the commercial transaction will have priority over the personal or business loan.

The economic pattern of the past few years supports this analysis. The home-building industry was the first major non-government segment of the economy to be hit by the credit squeeze. Capital squeezes then disrupted the capital-intensive technological industries. Small businesses, with little economic leverage, have been hurt substantially. Now, general industrial groups are beginning to stagnate. However, banks continue to compete vigorously for good quality consumer debt.

As a result of this credit pattern, consumer retail credit purchasing will be the last part of the economy to respond to the restrictive monetary policies of the type in effect now.

Limiting the money supply and increasing the cost of credit is already placing credit beyond the reach of some employers and causing them to lay off employees. If carried far enough, this policy could eventually cause enough bankruptcies and unemployment to reduce over-all consumer purchasing power substantially. This could eventually stabilize prices. However, by that point the economy is likely to be in a recessionary spiral that will be difficult to reverse.

Presumably, the administration will not intentionally make credit so expensive and scarce that it causes a depression. The administration spokesmen originally stated that present monetary policies would stop inflation without causing more than 4.0 to 4.5% unemployment.

It is now apparent that we are in an economic recession, with rising unemployment that already exceeds the administration projection. Furthermore, since widespread unemployment is necessary to the effectiveness of an expensive-credit program that does not directly limit consumer purchasing power, the present balancing act will only prolong the present combination of inflation and economic stagnation, thereby causing unnecessary unemployment, unnecessary financial neglect of the environment, housing, education, and the poor, and an unnecessary weakening of America's long-run ability to compete economically with other nations.

Present monetary policies are not only ineffective as a means of stopping "demand-pull" inflation but they also contribute substantially to what is described as "cost-push" inflation. For example, high interest rates and an inadequate money supply directly increase the cost of housing, which is one of the major factors in the rising cost of living. High interest rates substantially increase the cost of government debt financing, placing upward pressures on state and local taxes. Manufacturers and service industries increase prices to compensate for higher production costs brought about, in part, by the rising cost of credit. Wage-earners and suppliers increase their demands to compensate for rising prices, taxes, and housing costs. This in turn causes further price increases, resulting in a spiraling inflation that is, in part, directly caused by high interest rates.

To stabilize the cost of living most effectively, consumer purchasing power must be reduced directly. Money and other industrial resources must be diverted from general consumption to housing and the capital goods industries. Both processes can be ac-

complished by requiring mandatory minimum down payments on the purchase of consumer goods. In addition, credit must be made less expensive and more available.

Mandatory down payments can be required now under existing legislation. They are a proven means of controlling inflation. They would cause substantially less unemployment than is caused by present policies. Their implementation would allow a prompt reduction in interest rates and make price and wage controls unnecessary.

MINIMUM DOWN PAYMENTS SHOULD BE REQUIRED ON CONSUMER GOODS AND SERVICES

A minimum down payment of thirty per cent should be required on all purchases of consumer goods and services that cost more than \$10.00. Food, housing, medicine, health aids, medical services, and education should be exempt. Lending institutions should not be allowed to lend this down payment to the consumer. In addition, there should be limitations on the time over which the balance could be paid. Substantially equal installments should be required. The intervals between installments should be no longer than 30 days.

This program will counter inflation in three ways: (1) it will reduce demand for consumer goods and services; (2) it will lower the seller's cost of supplying those goods; (3) it will increase supply by diverting more capital into housing and capital goods industries.

(1) Reduce consumer demand

Increasing down payments will inhibit inflation because the consumer will have to defer purchases of the affected goods until he has accumulated the down payment. Initially, this will cause a sharp and immediate decrease in the effective demand for goods on which a down payment is necessary. Although demand will increase as various consumers accumulate down payments, it will remain lower than it was prior to the effective date of the down payment requirement. This occurs because many people are unable to save, and because prepayment requirements discourage nonessential purchases.

(2) Lower production costs

As consumers accumulate money in order to make down payments on selected items, they will have less money with which to purchase other goods and services. This will require them to be more selective in their other purchases. As this selectivity occurs, manufacturers of less desirable goods must either lower their prices or decrease their output. If they decrease their output they will compete less for the resources which go into those goods. This will lessen the overall demand for those resources, exert a downward pressure on their prices, and cause them to be diverted into the production of goods and services for which there is a stronger demand. Industries producing goods for which there is high demand will be able to pay less for the components of their products. Lower costs should be reflected in lower or at least stable prices for the finished products.

(3) Divert capital to building industries

Some existing savings might be used for down payments. However, most consumers will not deplete emergency funds for non-essential goods. Consequently, they will attempt to accumulate the necessary down payment. Much of this money is likely to be deposited with a lending institution. At the same time, the consumer's use of credit will be reduced by the down-payment requirement. Increased down payments will also reduce the retailer's need for credit. Through the natural interaction of supply and demand for credit, each of these developments will lessen the competition for credit and will make more money available for housing construction and for the capital goods in-

dustry. This will reduce the cost of credit to those industries.

Diversion of funds to housing is obviously desirable. Present policies impede new housing construction and greatly increase the cost of new mortgages on existing housing. This is a major element in the rising cost of living.

The desirability of increasing funds for expanding the capital goods industry is more controversial. However, to the extent that the rising cost of living is caused by excessive demand for consumer goods, increasing industrial capacity to supply that demand will eventually place more of the scarce goods on the market and thereby reduce the ability of sellers to raise prices.

THE CREDIT CONTROL ACT OF 1969 AUTHORIZES CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS AND WILL NOT PLACE AN UNDUE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN ON EITHER BUSINESSMEN OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Credit Control Act of 1969, tit. II, Pub. L. No. 91-151, 83 Stat. 371, gives the President discretionary authority to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to institute credit controls "whenever the President determines that such action is necessary or appropriate for the purpose of preventing or controlling inflation generated by the extension of credit in an excessive volume. . . ."

The proposals of this paper are well within the power authorized by this statute.

Moreover, the inspection procedures and business records which would be necessary for the enforcement of consumer credit controls are already provided for in Federal Reserve Board Regulation "Z", which implements the Truth in Lending Act of 1968, tit. II, Pub. L. No. 90-321, 82 Stat. 146. Consequently, consumer credit controls will not place an undue administrative burden on either businessmen or the government.

CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS ARE A PROVEN MEANS OF INFLATION CONTROL

The overwhelming success of Federal Reserve Board Regulation "W" as a means of controlling inflation during World War II demonstrates the effectiveness of minimum down-payment requirements as an anti-inflationary tool. The total consumer debt was reduced from \$9.7 billion on September 1, 1941, the effective date of Regulation "W", to \$5.8 billion on January 31, 1943. \$1.0 billion of this reduction occurred within the first two months. Although other anti-inflation devices such as price and wage controls were in effect then, it is generally agreed that the mandatory down-payment program was primarily responsible for reducing existing consumer debt.

Operation of the New York Stock Exchange "margin system" provides another example of the close relationship between down payments and price.

OTHER ADVANTAGES OF CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS

During the first quarter of 1970, the ratio of outstanding consumer debt to the gross national product was 10.1%. In 1929, shortly before the stock market crash, the ratio was only 6.2%. The present high ratio is an extremely dangerous condition, which should be corrected promptly. It has been demonstrated before that a substantial economic downturn is likely to collapse an excessively large debt structure, changing recession into depression.

Consumer credit controls should be applied now while consumer demand is high. This would lessen the likelihood of economic disaster. It would also build a reserve of consumer demand which could be released in subsequent months if a severe recession should develop. This demand could also be released when it is needed to facilitate the economic transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

Because high interest rates discourage the expansion of industrial capacity without dis-

couraging consumer-purchasing power, they are also exacerbating the existing imbalance between supply and demand. This is ironic because the condition of demand exceeding supply is one of the classic definitions of inflation. Furthermore, a continuation of present policies will seriously impede America's ability to restore her vanishing balance of international trade. Rising domestic prices and falling domestic output encourage imports and depress exports. Consumer credit controls have the opposite result. Cutting domestic consumption discourages imports. To the extent that it causes supply to exceed demand, it also encourages exports. Increasing industrial output has a similar effect.

Present monetary policies are increasing the cost of governmental debt financing at the same time taxable business profits and taxable personal income are decreasing. This tends to cause budget deficits, which are inflationary. Moreover, since more expensive credit causes higher prices, and since interest payments are deductible from federal income taxes, the government is, in effect, underwriting the inflation that is caused by high interest rates. Consumer credit controls can control inflation without requiring high interest rates. Consequently, implementation of the program outlined in this paper would allow the government to get out of the business of financing inflation.

High interest rates are making it difficult for all levels of government to fund needed social and environmental programs. These programs have been restricted so that the various levels of government can pay the rising cost of refinancing existing debt obligations. The federal government should not intentionally pursue monetary policies which, to be successful, must cause unemployment and which, at the same time, reduce the ability of state and local governments to provide help to the unemployed. Neither should local government be forced to ignore other social and environmental problems that weaken the nation. Consumer credit controls would reduce inflation without causing further deterioration in the quality of national life.

Another advantage of the program outlined in this paper is that it would not limit the availability of essentials such as food, housing, education, and health aids; nor would it limit the availability of essential services.

Consumer credit controls also avoid the problems associated with price and wage controls. It is true that many people speak of "price, wage, and credit controls" as an indivisible trinity. This, however, is nonsense. There are many obvious differences in the administrative nature and the effects of these tools. There is a great difference in the way in which they interfere with other institutions such as collective bargaining and the market economy.

Furthermore, it should be quite clear that through its manipulation of numerous other fiscal and monetary tools the federal government already manages the economy. More direct regulation of consumer credit would not be a radical departure from any previous policy of nonintervention. The decision to intervene has already been made. The choice is not between intervention and nonintervention. It is between various types of intervention. The policy outlined in this paper would be both more effective and less dangerous than present ones.

SOME LOOSENING OF MONETARY RESTRAINT IS NECESSARY TO PREVENT A CONTINUED RECESSION AND A DANGEROUS DETERIORATION OF INDUSTRIAL CAPACITY

Consumer credit controls should be accompanied by easier monetary policies, because present policies are causing a recession and are not stopping inflation. Furthermore, although they will cause less unemployment than would a continuation of pres-

ent policies, consumer credit controls will cause some temporary unemployment as retail sales decline.

Lowering interest rates and increasing the money supply will create jobs rapidly in the building and aerospace industries. This alone should more than compensate for the unemployment caused by consumer credit controls. Moreover, an increased availability of less expensive credit would stimulate industrial expansion in parts of the economy that produce goods for which there is high demand. Such expansion would place more of the high-demand goods on the market and tend to stabilize their prices. Moreover, the expansion would provide jobs for some workers who are currently unemployed. American industry would be able to compete more effectively with foreign industry.

If recession becomes a greater danger than inflation, less restrictive monetary policies should precede consumer credit controls. Consumer credit controls could then be applied when unemployment begins to decrease or when retail sales begin to climb again, whichever comes first.

A 5% investment tax credit should be considered if the unemployment rate exceeds 4.8% on July 1, 1970. This measure would increase productivity and reduce unemployment. It would enhance America's competitive position in international trade.

CONCLUSION

Consumer credit controls are a proven means of controlling inflation that would be more effective and less burdensome than present policies. Implementing them would allow a quick return to less restrictive monetary policies. They could be easily administered under existing legislation. They avoid the problems associated with price and wage controls.

Consumer credit controls of this type do not deprive anyone of anything. They only defer purchases of less essential goods until the consumer can make a reasonable down payment. In comparison with the consequences of present policies, this is a relatively small price to pay for a stable cost of living and full employment.

STATEMENT ON CAMBODIA

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. MANN. Mr. Ben Bagwell, chairman, Social Ministry Committee, Saint Michael's Lutheran Church, Greenville, S.C., has communicated to me the concern of the members of his church over the statement of the board of ministry of the Lutheran Church in America concerning the Cambodian issue. The church council of Saint Michael's issued a statement on Cambodia, and wanted it to be known that there are certainly some Lutherans who believe that President Nixon is sincerely attempting to shorten the war. I offer the church council statement for the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON CAMBODIA

We the Church Council of St. Michael's Lutheran Church, Greenville, South Carolina, in session May 12, 1970, take exception to the position of the Board of Social Ministry in its statement of May 8, 1970 RE: Cambodia/Laos/Vietnam and responsible action by American Christians. We believe the Board of Social Ministry is failing to uphold the principles outlined in the Social Statement of Lutheran Church in America on

Vietnam adopted by the Third Biennial Convention in June, 1966 where it states, (4) "To stand in compassion and understanding beside those to whom the conduct of national policy is entrusted, to pray for them and to support them, though not uncritically, in their efforts to solve the dilemmas they face." Further we as Lutherans feel President Nixon has done nothing regarding his Cambodian policy that merits our distrust and that he is, in our belief, trying to produce peace . . . not an expanded war. We note that President Nixon has also withdrawn American troops in accord with his earlier announcements and that until he fails to meet his promises he is worthy of our trust and prayers. It should be further noted that President Nixon did not run as a "piece at any price" candidate, but promised during his campaign to produce "peace with honor." Since the American people elected him, it seems he should be given an opportunity to fulfill his pledge.

EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that \$65 billion is spent annually for education in the United States. Despite this expenditure, many schools are failing in their efforts to educate students, particularly at the elementary level.

More and more administrators and school boards are beginning to recognize that tools to evaluate the educational process and its products must be devised. One word which symbolizes this whole process is "accountability."

I submit an article by Ron Schwartz appearing in the June issue of Nation's Schools for the benefit of my colleagues. It is a concise statement of developments in this area:

ACCOUNTABILITY—PRODDING BY USOE OFFICIALS, CONGRESSMEN AND COST-CONSCIOUS CITIZENS ARE FOCUSING ON WHAT COMES OUT OF THEIR SCHOOLS—NOT WHAT GOES IN

(By Ron Schwartz)

When National Education Association president George D. Fischer appeared before the House general subcommittee on education last November, he was asked—of all things—to "give evidence that education is better at present than it was approximately 12 years ago".

"We now turn to you and say what . . . benchmarks do we have to show the vast improvements in education which we were told 12 years ago would be forthcoming if we put dollars in," asked Rep. John R. Delenbeck (R-Ore.). After the hearing was over, Fischer provided for the subcommittee record five statistical exhibits:

(1) From 1958 to 1968, per pupil expenditures rose from \$340 to \$634; (2) the number of elementary teachers with bachelor's degrees jumped from 75.3 to 95.3 per cent; (3) teachers salaries rose from an annual average of \$4,775 to \$7,908; (4) the dropout rate has decreased and (5) the number of individuals failing the selective service mental test has fallen.

Subcommittee member Albert H. Quie (R-Minn.) later indicated dissatisfaction with these benchmarks, and his thinking reflects that of the Nixon Administration: That educators have for too long stressed the input side of education—number of books, build-

ing, master's degrees, etc. "We have, as a nation, too long avoided thinking of the productivity of schools," said President Nixon in his February message on education reform.

"I think we're going to demand accountability in education from now on in Congress," Rep. Quie told NATION'S SCHOOLS, and, as USOE associate commissioner Don Davies predicts: "Accountability will soon replace 'relevance' as the 'in' word among educators."

In its broadest sense, accountability in education means that schools, administrators and teachers would be held responsible for the improvement, or lack of improvement, in the performance of their students.

PUSH FROM COLEMAN REPORT

The concept of accountability received a major push from the so-called Coleman report, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," which empirically indicated that input into schools is not an accurate measurement of how good they really are.

The Coleman report compared schools attended by whites and ones attended by Negroes, and it found that there was a disparity of skills among the two groups despite equal inputs, including per pupil expenditure, number of books per student, laboratory facilities, and audiovisual equipment.

The theory of accountability in education was, following the Coleman report, developed and refined by Leon M. Lessinger, Calloway professor of urban education at Georgia State University. The most vociferous spokesman, if not the father of accountability, Lessinger, as associate commissioner for elementary and secondary education at USOE until last January, grafted the concept of accountability onto federally funded projects under Titles VII and VIII of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act.

Lessinger initiated the study now underway at USOE in which 86 bilingual (Title VII) and dropout prevention (Title VIII) projects are subjected to program audits. Previously, federal education projects were only audited on a fiscal basis, in order to make sure that the federal money was spent according to the specifications of the law (see facing page).

In the 86 projects, "independent educational accomplishment auditors," trained by USOE, will pass judgement on the administration of the project by local officials, and they will monitor the project's success in meeting previously established student-performance goals. The auditors will submit their audit report twice a year, with the first project reports due this August. If this prototype audit program proves successful, USOE officials will probably expand the concept to include other projects and other Titles of ESEA.

PERFORMANCE TURN-KEYS

If Lessinger is remembered at USOE for his push in accountability, he will also be known for his effort to apply the performance contracting concept to accountability.

As defined by Lessinger in a "confidential and highly sensitive" memorandum to the White House last December, performance contracting is an "educational engineering" process "whereby a school contracts with private firms, chosen competitively, to remove educational deficiencies on a guaranteed performance basis or suffer penalties. Without being told what program is to be used, the contractor is encouraged to innovate in a responsible manner. Upon successful demonstration, the contractor's program is adopted by the school on a turnkey basis."

Since the first performance contract became a reality in October, 1969, in the Texarkana, Ark., schools, advocates of the concept have found themselves speaking and writing on it on numerous occasions. The attention generated by Texarkana was only natural, after large gains were spotted in

reading and mathematics. In March, the first full scale standardized tests which were given after 60 to 80 hours of instruction prescribed in the performance contract showed the students gained, on the average, 1.4 grade levels in math and 2.2 grade levels in reading. These results surpassed the guarantee of the contractor, Dorsett Educational Systems, Inc., which had agreed to produce one grade level increase in math or reading in 80 hours. As Charles L. Blaschke, education consultant to the project, applied the concept to the Texarkana contract, the school system, if the program is successful, will build its own management structure for running the program and then buy out the project from Dorsett over a period of five years.

Although the early success of Texarkana has drawn attention to the performance contracting approach to accountability, it still lacks important converts, one being Rep. Quie, who fears that teaching companies would turn to the federal government for aid, if their performance contracts, and consequently their profits, fall. The situation, Quie adds, would be like Lockheed, a reference to the defense contractor who turned to the federal government for financial assistance after taking a beating on its C5-A bomber.

And, USOE commissioner, James E. Allen Jr., has yet to give more than an interested glance in the direction of performance contracting and industry involvement. "All of this is in the exploratory stage," says Allen. "We don't know yet whether this is the answer to . . . raising the level of education of the disadvantaged."

Allen feels that the best prospects for Texarkana-type projects rest in Title III of ESEA (the Texarkana program had been funded under Title VIII). "Here's a perfect place where some performance contracts can be worked out by states and local schools," Allen says.

However, the first effort of a school district to Apply Title III money to a performance contract was recently snagged at USOE, when officials announced there wasn't enough Title III money left in the Fiscal 1970 budget to fund it. Thinking that the money was in hand, the San Diego City schools announced that beginning in the fall of 1970, Educational Development Laboratories, would begin a guaranteed reading program for 9,600 elementary students reading below grade level. The cost would be \$1.4 million over a three-year period. The school system also hoped to contract but on a non-performance basis with Science Research Associates, a subsidiary of IBM, for teaching 6,000 students in reading, language concepts, and arithmetic.

MORE HANDS IN THE ACT

While California schoolmen were trying to pry some money loose for the San Diego project, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced plans for its own performance contracting experiment. At the end of April, OEO asked that some 35 educational teaching firms submit proposals for teaching reading and mathematics in Grades 1 to 3 and 7 to 9 in 26 disadvantaged schools. Of these schools, to be selected by OEO, 24 would operate on performance contracting and two would use a standard reimbursement contract. Six companies will be chosen by June to participate in the \$5.4 million experiment.

With OEO getting into the act, it appears as though performance contracting is an issue bigger than Allen's office. One of the steps in this direction came last December when Lessinger submitted his "confidential" memo to the White House in which he said, "the education engineering approach will make it possible for this Administration to extend its basic philosophy into the educational system."

A MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most excellent address "A Memorial Day Tribute" delivered by a man of honor and courage who loves his country, Rear Adm. Ernst Ruth, Jr., U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, on Memorial Day, 1970, at the National Cemetery at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Rear Admiral Ruth's remarks eloquently restate the greatness that is our country and clarify the issues facing the country. Mr. Ruth's remarks follow:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1970

As long as anyone of us here can remember on this day in May each year people gather together in just such groups as ours today. In every town, hamlet and city in this country to honor the memory of those men who have fought for our country and have died. We are gathered here in one of the national cemeteries, those hallowed plots of ground which the people have dedicated in so many places in this country and in foreign countries, where our soldiers and sailors can find a final resting place and having found their place of rest, we the living, can come to them to honor their memory. Many of you here today have dear ones, sons, fathers, husbands, brothers lying beneath these markers. All of us have friends to remember and together we honor the memory of their unselfish service to us. Memory. What do we remember? Why what we remember is history.

In our almost two hundred years as a nation we have been threatened many times by forces that would destroy our unity, take our territory, deny us access to the oceans of the world. At each of these threats we as a united people sent our armed men to put down these threats and the markers on these graves recite for us the chronicle of brave men who died that we may live as a nation. In these present days we are threatened from within by divisive forces that we do not fully understand. We do not understand the war in Viet Nam. We recall that in previous calls to arms the country was fully informed about the enemy and why we were in the conflict. In the Vietnam war we are resisting aggression against our country. We are maintaining access to the oceans of the world. We are resisting forces which would disrupt our unity.

I say to you that three administrations have failed to adequately explain to the American people the nature of this war. I also say that previous administrations have failed to prosecute the war to the fullest capabilities of our Armed Forces and have failed to interdict the supplies going to the enemy which have served to prolong this conflict. We are unwilling to identify our adversaries. We use the word "communism" and "Communist" in generic context which no longer has the meaning that we intend in this context except that it is still analogous to world domination. Even within the so-called "Communist Countries" it has been redefined and continues to be defined and argued there. What we can be sure of is that our adversaries regardless of the label are Russia and China these are the countries that are threatening us. They try to impose their style of government on weak countries. Wherever in this world a powerful nation imposes its will on others by taking away freedom of action our nation is threatened because we do not have free access to

the peoples and their products of commerce, to their ideas nor do such subject people have access to us. In Viet Nam it is not Hanoi who is the aggressor it is Russia and China and we are fighting there to resist their aggression against our country. History tells us all too clearly that we were attacked in 1941 and our sailors lying at rest in the bowels of the USS Arizona in Pearl Harbor in our Sister State Hawaii, their silent voices shout out to us that we were attacked by an aggressive country from across the Pacific who also wished to extend its imposition of power on other countries as it had done in Manchuria and particularly to deny America access to the western oceans.

No independent nation can continue to exist and retain its power without having other nations or grouping of nations constantly looking for ways to weaken that power. For a moment let us consider the meaning of the word "power." We speak of America as the most powerful nation on earth. Power for America can be defined, and is best defined, as the ability to use all of our resources in concert to maintain the freedoms which our constitution guarantees. So if we are the most powerful nation this means that we are able to maintain more freedoms in America against all aggressions from inside or outside this country than any other country in the world. I say to you that I believe sincerely and adamantly that we are the most powerful country in the world and derive our power from the freedoms that we maintain, it seems timely and appropriate for the detractors of the power of our Constitutional systems in this country to be forced to prove their case rather than that the others of us should think we must write apologies or talk softly of justifications.

The face of happenings in the world where peoples freedoms are tampered with or taken away how can anyone of us in this country feel that we must apologize to any one. It is also timely and appropriate that our elected officials at all levels stand up to the maintenance of orderly processes of government and involve themselves directly in confrontation of the attacks on our freedoms. Power then in America comes from a multitude of sources and in the final confrontation with a nation who would challenge us we resort to military force and that is why we are here today to honor those who were called on to exert this kind of power. Military force has changed since the first men were laid to rest here. The weapons of the 1800s were overshadowed by the big berthas of the German army in WWI. These massive guns yielded to the "A" bomb of WWII and today the "H" bomb possessed by 5 countries all of whom can deliver it if they choose—the tools of war today are truly awful, truly terrible, truly monstrous. Are we to be deterred from protecting ourselves from aggressive threats because these weapons are monstrous. Are we to say to our adversaries, we will not maintain the best final military defense it is possible for us to do. We have not said this, our adversaries know that we will maintain any necessary defenses. They are now deploying additional naval forces and moving their air forces into strategic areas, confident that the stalemate of nuclear response has been established. They will use the more conventional weapons to gain their ends of aggression. To retain the power to protect our freedoms we must as a nation be ready to respond to aggressive actions no matter what form they take. These aggressive actions are not always in the form of military pressures. These actions may be and are taken in the realms of undermining our civil government. They can be effective when a few teachers or professors in our secondary schools or colleges teach the overthrow of our constitutional guarantees. Such aggressive actions are nurtured by college administrators who are either afraid of personal confrontation or are artlessly credulous or craftily naive. Not only do

these administrators not protect our freedoms but they destroy the objectivity of colleges and universities. These institutions for learning can not function as such if they become centers of political agitation. The administrators and trustees of these institutions must expell the leaders of this rebellion and all of the rebellious members. At the centers of learning in America we must reestablish the freedoms so that those who are paying and struggling for an education to better confront this fast moving world can get on with learning. And I am not talking here of the freedom of expression, no, I maintain that any student if he has the time or desire may listen to poems or join the ROTC program, do anything that increases his knowledge, he must not be kept away from his classrooms or from any access that is normally and lawfully available to any student, and when there he will allow others full freedom of their expression. If these freedoms are not maintained why should any funds private or public be devoted to the maintenance of these institutions. You the parents of the children of this generation must try to understand what are the problems and hang ups that confront these children. These children are thrust into this present era wholly defenseless. When you were young you could go to your parents for counsel in the problems of your day, but today not only do the children not know the answers but neither do their parents. Your children beg you to interpret the new and terrible forces that are rampant in the world.

You must make it clear to them that only in the atmosphere of freedom and personal liberty can these young people unmask the hypocrisy of those in authority, or identify those enemies who would destroy us. They must understand that it is only by destroying our freedoms that we as a Nation can be destroyed. If you as parents do not counsel your children then they will learn from others and they may never know what our freedoms are. Above all you, you as a parent, must take a stand as these men lying beneath these markers took their stand.

I say to the young people here today and everywhere in this land, do not be misled by those who tell you that history is for the birds. Every man lying in this cemetery whether he fought in the War of 1840, Korea or Viet Nam died for you. You young men and women did not suddenly appear on the scene as if never before was there anything, the creation happened only once but the drama of life has been played for Eons. Each succeeding generation has added its contribution to the script. It just happens that those writing the script in the last 30 years have interjected a whole array of new situations into this drama of life. The television that you stare at, the radio you listen to. The atom and hydrogen bombs were not invented by your parents. They simply put them together. If Sir Isaac Newton, or William Roentgen, or Marie Curie or Steinmetz or Galileo, or Euclid or thousands of others in scientific history had not contributed their bit to unlocking the workings of the universe then your forbears could not have put these new elements into our life. But if our forbears has not assembled these things, then you young people would have had to do it. And believe me you would have and your children would wonder why and you would have to explain. There is a lot you will have to explain to your children and I say that you had better get on with it so that you do a better job than we are doing for you now. You young people of this generation have been pampered and are ill prepared for the toughness that you find in the world, and I believe that you are in revolt against this pampering. In your veins runs the blood of action, the excitement of the pioneer, physical action, in New Mexico people experienced these things only yesterday.

But today excitement must take a different direction, you are the generation which will set the new directions in America and therefore in the world. The measure of the success of your direction will be your understanding of history's lessons so don't waste your precious time protecting things you can't possibly understand unless you have spent your hours in study of the past. You should be Ralph Naders delving into the workings of our present forms of government. You should be studying the philosophical history of our country so that you could know the origin of our laws and our institutions. You have to know these things in order to change things for the better, you must not be surprised if you find violent opposition to the violence that is happening. And one other thing must be said, we hear that there is only a small minority of the youth in this country who are the radicals depending on force and destroying property.

And that the majority are too busy with their studies to confront these radical young people. I ask you to take the time to address the administrators of your colleges and universities the trustees and the alumni and petition them to expell the leaders of the rebellion otherwise you may well find that the public will no longer provide the funds that make it possible for you to pursue your education. If you are not willing to make the effort now it may be impossible to do later. The time has come to step forward out of the silent baffled majority and reclaim yourselves.

And so today we pay reverent tribute to these men lying here. They tell us that finally a nation maintains its strength, its fiber, its laws and its territory only thru armed men taking a stand.

I do not want to equate the sacrifice of these men with the confusion of terms we hear today. Words like, relevant and meaningful, miss the tone of their sacrifice. They gave their lives for that precious gift which transcends the senseless violence of the mob, the haughty hypocrisy of the official who refuses to be involved in real human problems, the stern arrogance of the young and the old when they refuse to appreciate mutual values. They died for the special God-given right we all possess. The right to seek our destiny independently but under the mantle of just laws. They died in the hope that all men would have the right to property, to liberty, to equal treatment, to redress for injury and the deep concern of the officials who represent them in the Nation's forums. These men die in vain if we here and throughout this broad land, become indolent in looking at our world. If we judge every student by his hair style rather than his life style. If we assume that those who take arms in the military services are evil because arms are evil. If we deny liberty because some use it beyond reasonable bounds. In effect if we think in such a shallow way that we can label everyone as exactly right or wrong, rather than recognize the infinite complexity and beauty of human life then we fail these men, for it is through indolence and intolerance and the negligence that these bring that the very heritage of these brave men will be threatened. God grant that it is never our lot to abandon that heritage.

PRESIDENT HAS CUT DOWN ON
DEFENSE SPENDING

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the President has demonstrated that, despite

the outcries from administration critics, he has cut down on defense spending. All of the recent criticism that attempts to show that the President has somehow or other been taking money away from domestic needs in order to bolster the defense industry has, by his speech, been forever silenced.

Yet the same critics who demand that there be less money spent on defense are precisely those who cry out because there has been a rise in unemployment.

I ask these critics: How can you cut back on defense spending without having unemployment among defense workers?

It is impossible. I call for a moratorium on criticism by those who want to eat their unemployment cake and have defense cutbacks, too.

We are in transition. It is a difficult period. It is a period when politics as usual just will not do. I urge all those who have wanted cutbacks without unemployment to honestly face the facts as the President has.

SLOVAK WORLD CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Slovak World Congress with representatives of Slovak organizations from all parts of the free world will meet in New York City from June 19 to 21 to promote the following aims and objectives:

First. To aid and assist in the united effort of the Slovak people behind the Iron Curtain in the achievement of regaining their freedom, democracy, and independence.

Second. To promote among the Slovaks throughout the free world a concentrated effort in taking a greater part in the public life and contribute in every way possible of their talents to the countries of which they are now loyal citizens.

Third. To contribute to the continuing struggle of the free world in the protection against the Communist threat in all democratic countries.

Persons of Slovak descent are numbered among the Nations of Eastern Europe. For many years discussions were held concerning the independent state of Slovakia. In 1918 an effort was made by a Slovak organization in Pittsburgh to realize the dream of such an independent state.

The Slovaks have a history of long and determined struggle for freedom and independence. Their struggle is particularly courageous considering the victories attained were few and short-lived.

The Slovaks in their efforts to regain freedom, democracy, and independence seek only the right which is the prerogative of all men: the right to determine their own destiny.

I congratulate the members and representatives attending the Slovak World Congress and wish them success in their undertaking.

TRADE UNION RIGHTS IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, several times during the past few months, I have included in the RECORD various data depicting the cancer of racism officially and formally manufactured by the Government of South Africa under the brand name of "apartheid." Discrimination under the evils of apartheid is aptly described in a paper entitled "Trade Union Rights in South Africa" reported by the ad hoc working groups of experts of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. This group was requested by the Economic and Social Council in 1967 to investigate allegations of infringements of trade union rights in South Africa.

The paper referred to follows:

TRADE UNION RIGHTS IN SOUTH AFRICA SUMMARY OF SOME RELEVANT LAWS

The basic laws concerning trade union rights and related labour matters in South Africa have been reproduced or analysed in the first and the second reports of the Group. They will be recalled briefly hereunder. In addition, some amendments or new legislation enacted or proposed since the issuance of the last report will be summarized.

The right to form and join trade unions

In accordance with the Industrial Conciliation Act, 1956, as amended, employees organizations (trade unions) may become body corporates and, as such institute lawsuits, acquire or alienate property, and perform any other acts which their constitutions permit them to do, only upon registration. Since Africans are excluded from the definition of "employees" under the Act, African trade unions—which in fact exist—may not be registered and may not function as body corporates.

The Industrial Conciliation Act contains several provisions which tend to discourage the establishment and functioning of "mixed" unions, consisting of "white" and "coloured" employees.

Participation in collective bargaining and settlement of labour disputes

Only registered trade unions may be represented on the Industrial Councils and Conciliation Boards established by the Industrial Conciliation Act for collective bargaining and the settlement of labour disputes. African trade unions may therefore play no part in those procedures.

The Bantu Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act, 1953, as amended, established a procedure for the settlement of Bantu labour disputes in which, however, no elected Africans may take part with the right to vote.

The right to strike

In accordance with the Industrial Conciliation Act, strikes by "whites" and "coloured" employees are lawful, under certain conditions. Strikes by Africans are totally prohibited and are criminal offences under the Bantu Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act.

Protection against anti-union discrimination

Under the Industrial Conciliation Act, victimization of "white" or "coloured" employees for their trade union membership or activities constitutes, under certain conditions, a criminal offence. Members of African trade unions do not enjoy such legal protec-

tion. They have some protection only as regards victimization for their participation in the election or operation of a Works Committee, a purely advisory body of African workers established by the Bantu Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act. Furthermore, a number of statutes and regulations could be used to persecute or harass trade-unionists, particularly African trade-unionists, who do not enjoy the benefits conferred by registration. These laws are, in particular: the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950, as amended; the Unlawful Organizations Act, 1960; the Bantu (Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents) Act, 1952; the Bantu (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act, 1945, as amended, as well as other provisions of the so-called influx control legislation, the effect of which may be, *inter alia*, to facilitate the removal from the area of their activity of African trade union leaders whose influence has become embarrassing for the Government; section 21 of the General Law Amendment Act, 1962, the so-called "Sabotage Act"; the Criminal Procedure Amendment Act, 1965, the so-called "180-day law"; and the Terrorism Act, 1967.

Equality of opportunity and treatment as regards employment and occupation

A number of types of employment are closed to Africans, irrespective of their qualification, under the system of "job reservations" established by section 77 of the Industrial Conciliation Act and other laws.

Provisions which may have the effect of subjecting workers to forced labour and slavery or to practices akin to forced labour and slavery

Under the Bantu (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act, 1945, as amended, no Bantu may remain for more than 72 hours in an urban area unless he was born there and has been residing in such area for long continuous periods, or he has been granted permission to remain in the area or to take up employment there. Provision is made for removing to their reserves or to resettlement areas of the Bantu found in urban areas who do not qualify for residence there. Under the Bantu Labour Regulations, 1965, every male Bantu over fifteen years of age who is unemployed in urban areas, and who qualifies for residence there, must seek employment with the local Bantu Labour Bureau. If he refuses without reasonable cause to accept the vacancies offered to him by the Bureau, he may, as an "idle" or "undesirable" person, be sent to his reserve or to various penal institutions, or be ordered to work for a private employer for a specified period. Bantu workers must always be in possession of, and show on demand, their "reference books", and failure to produce such book to any authorized officer is punishable with a fine or imprisonment for up to one month.

The Bantu Labour Regulations (Bantu Areas) which came into force on 1 April 1968 extend the system of labour control to the Bantu areas, except the Transkei. The Regulations provide that every Bantu living in such areas should register for employment with tribal or territorial Labour Bureaux. Such bureaux should endeavour to place him in employment. Under penalties of a fine or imprisonment up to fourteen days no Bantu may leave such areas if his contract for employment outside the Bantu area provides for a period of service of more than one year. The effect of these Regulations would be to make it practically impossible for Africans to seek permanent work in urban areas, except for those who, for reason of birth or long continuous residence in such areas, qualify for such work.

The Bantu Laws Amendment Bill, as submitted by the Government to the House of Assembly in 1969, would have the effect of further reducing the freedom of African

workers to seek employment of their own choosing.² In accordance with section II of the bill, the following provision would be inserted in the Bantu Labour Act, 1964:

"20A. (1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any law, the Minister may by notice in the Gazette prohibit the performance of work by or the employment or continued employment of a Bantu

"(a) in a specified area;
 "(b) in a specified class of employment;
 "(c) in a specified trade; or
 "(d) in the service of a specified employer or class of employers.

"(2) A prohibition referred to in subsection (1) (b) (e) or (d) may be applied either in a specified area or generally.

"(3) A person who contravenes a prohibition referred to in subsection (1), shall be guilty of an offence."

It will be recalled that domestic and agricultural workers are still subject to the provisions of the old "Master and Servant Laws" which, *inter alia*, provide for severe criminal sanctions for breach of contract of employment.

It will further be recalled that the Coloured Cadets Training Act, 1967, establishes a system of compulsory training for coloured youth, with penal sanctions in case of failure to report for such training.

ANALYSIS OF EVIDENCE

The right to form and join trade unions

The attention of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts was drawn to the fifth special report of the Director-General of the International Labour Organization on the application of the Declaration concerning *Apartheid* in the Republic of South Africa by the ILO representative, Mr. Von Knorring. He told the Working Group that the immense majority of the workers, which is made up of African manpower, is excluded entirely from labour organizations. The above-mentioned ILO report noted that out of a total of some 2,200,000 workers employed in mining, manufacturing, construction, transport, communications and public authorities in 1968, only about 520,000, or less than a quarter, belonged to trade unions which could negotiate for wages and conditions of work on their behalf.

It was further mentioned in the ILO report that some fifteen African unions were in existence, with about 12,260 members. According to another source,³ only about 2 per cent of African workers were organized in trade unions. As was noted earlier, African trade unions are not illegal as such, but they may not be registered and, therefore, they cannot participate in the bargaining machinery. The Working Group was informed by Mr. Shope⁴ that the organizing of African trade unions still goes on in the country, but that unions were small and not powerful. They were small because employers and the Government make it impossible for people to organize. Witnesses indicated that several methods are being used by the Government of South Africa to interfere with the rights of workers, and particularly of African workers, to form and join trade unions: trade unionists are being arrested and persecuted daily in South Africa, some are detained *incommunicado*, tortured and murdered (see next subsection). Thus, as stressed in the ILO report, the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), which is an almost entirely African trade union co-ordinating body, is banned and is effectively prevented from carrying out any trade union activities as all its leaders have either left the country or are under banning orders. The Government's policy of maintaining an African migratory labour force also effectively prevents African workers from forming or joining trade unions. People who are prevented from settling in any given place for long periods, it was said, cannot organize themselves effectively into trade unions.

The evidence before the Group tends to confirm that the policy of discouraging the establishment of racially mixed unions is being actively pursued. The Group noted in particular the complaint dated 25 November 1968 from the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical and Technical Employees, Geneva (E/4613), according to which:

"On the occasion of its recent meeting, the Executive Committee of the International Federation of Commercial, Clerical and Technical Employees (FIET) accepted the affiliation requested of the National Union of Commercial and Allied Workers, South Africa.

"This new organization is composed entirely of coloured colleagues, who formerly were an integral part of a long-time FIET affiliate in South Africa—the National Union of Distributive Workers (NUDW).

"As a result of the abhorrent and repugnant *apartheid* policy of the South African Government, the NUDW was forced to separate its coloured membership and either let them suffer without adequate trade union protection and representation or assist them to establish a separate union to cater for their needs.

"In view of the above and in accepting the affiliation request, the FIET Executive Committee unanimously expressed sincere regret that the situation in South Africa had deteriorated to a point where separate unions had to be established for coloured colleagues. Likewise, it expressed utter condemnation of the system and the Government responsible for such a reprehensible state of affairs."

The representative of the ILO drew attention to information given in the above-mentioned ILO report concerning the decision taken by the Trade Union Congress of South Africa (TUCSA), on 19 February 1969, to exclude all unregistered—meaning African—unions from its ranks. In its last report, the Group had considered this matter and pointed out that this decision had been reached, under Government pressure, after a protracted struggle inside TUCSA. According to the ILO report, this new rule concerning membership in TUCSA is now entrenched; it may be altered only by the TUCSA General Conference by a card vote of not less than 80 per cent of the whole membership. Mr. Shope also commented on these recent developments concerning TUCSA.

The right of trade unions to function freely—Protection against anti-union discrimination

It was recalled in evidence by Mr. Shope that although South Africa does not expressly forbid the existence of African unions, it does refuse them all rights to participate in the machinery of labour relations and in collective bargaining. Although some African unions do exist in South Africa, in practice it is not possible for them to carry out trade union functions effectively. In addition to the legal and other impediments mentioned earlier that interfere with the right of African workers to exercise their trade union rights, African trade union leaders had been imprisoned, banned and "endorsed out" of urban and industrial areas.

Thus, in a communication dated 26 November 1969, the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), whose present provisional headquarters is in Tanzania, points out:

"The reports in the South African newspapers that 22 trade union and political militants, detained since early this year for their uncompromising resistance against fascist repression and terror by the South African authorities, will be brought to the Supreme Court, Pretoria, for summary trial on December 1st, 1969.

"This group of 22 is only part of over 100 detained since February this year and subjected to the most inhuman torture by the South African security police. Seven of them including the Vice-President of the South

African Congress of Trade Unions, and General-Secretary of African Textiles Industrial Unions, brother of Caleb Mayekiso, died in prison as a result of such brutal torture.

"Among the 22 cited for trial is brother Lawrence Ndzanga, Secretary of the African Railway Workers Union, both of them members of the Witwatersrand Local Committee of SACTU."

The charges against the accused included, besides co-operating with the African National Congress and other banned organizations, "employing measures to conceal the activities of the organization" and "having informal discussions and issuing instructions in regard to conducting the affairs of the organization".

Mr. Shope drew attention to the death in prison, under suspicious circumstances, of Mr. Caleb Mayekiso. Mr. Mayekiso had served a four-and-a-half-year jail term and, upon his release, was again arrested on 13 May 1969 under the "180-day law". On 1 June 1969, the police told his wife that he had died. Mrs. Mayekiso said that her husband looked well and healthy when he was arrested. According to the security police, he had died of natural causes. This case was reported to the Group also by the World Federation of Trade Unions in a letter dated 18 July 1969 and by several other organizations.

Mr. Shope gave statistical information concerning the number of persons arrested, imprisoned or fined for political offences. He said, in particular that during the period 1960-1967, about 4.5 million persons were arrested, imprisoned or fined under special racial laws, such as the pass laws: persons arrested and imprisoned for offences of "passive resistance", such as unlawful strikes, numbered about 120,000; persons arrested and detained without trial under the "180-day law" and other acts numbered 14,000; and persons imprisoned, *inter alia*, for attendance at unlawful meetings numbered about 1,000. Mr. Shope did not specify how many of the persons so detained were trade-unionists. It has been said, however, that many of the laws so mentioned could be used, and they were frequently alleged to have been used, in order to persecute trade-unionists, particularly African trade-unionists, and to paralyse African trade union activities.

It was further alleged that union offices are kept under surveillance and frequently raided by the Special Branch; officials are searched, organizers shadowed and their contacts interrogated; employers are warned to have no dealings with African unions and are informed of "dangerous elements" who should be dismissed, and landlords are advised to evict trade union tenants.⁶

It was also recalled that various laws prohibit almost entirely workers' meetings near their places of work; and that halls and other places for public meetings in urban areas are licensed for the use of whites only, while meetings in African townships are subject to permission by white officials. Furthermore, under section 9(3) of the Suppression of Communism Act, the Minister of Justice may prohibit any gathering if he deems it necessary to prevent the achievement of any of the—broadly defined—objects of "Communism."

The right to strike

Evidence was given to the Working Group that African workers are denied the right to strike and that a strike by African workers is an offense punishable by three years' imprisonment or £500 fine or both. Mr. Shope provided details of the dock strike in Durban in April 1969, when over 3,000 African dock workers, who work fourteen hours a day, went on strike demanding a wage increase from £3 per week to £7 per week. This witness indicated that all the striking dock workers were dismissed and endorsed out of Durban.

Footnotes at end of article.

Relationship of South African trade unions with international trade unions

Mr. Shope said that because of the restrictions imposed by the Government of South Africa, the assistance that the trade secretariat of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the trade union internationals of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) could provide African unions was largely confined to some legal and financial aid. As representatives of international trade unions operating outside South Africa were denied entry into that country, they could not, as in other countries, send in experts to help train African trade-unionists. International trade unions could not help organize African trade union seminars as Africans themselves cannot organize a trade union seminar on their own within their country. Restrictions on travel prevented Africans from access to ICFTU trade schools.

The right of everyone to equality of opportunity and treatment as regards his employment and occupation

(i) *Technical and vocational education.*—The information and statistics presented by Mr. Von Knorring showed the disparity that exists between the technical and vocational education provided for "whites" in South Africa with the same education provided for coloureds, Asians and Africans. An indication of the difficulty that non-whites have in obtaining equal opportunities as regard employment is revealed by the following figures of students enrolled in University Medical Faculties according to race groups.

Qualified as doctors (1967):

Whites	328
Coloureds	17
Asians	31
Africans	11

Enrolled as students (1968):

Whites	3,137
Coloureds	131
Asians	312
Africans	135

(ii) *Access to employment.*—The power of the Minister of Labour to make "job reservations" for persons of a specified race, and to prohibit the replacement of employees of one race by those of another race was in the great majority of cases designed to protect "white" workers from "non-white" competition, the Working Group was informed. Four new job reservations were made in favour of "whites" in 1968 to reinforce the statutory colour bar in certain occupations. Mr. Von Knorring stated that a distinction must be drawn between two types of job reservations: one type which is traditional or customary that limits the access of Africans to higher and more skilled jobs and that is not governed by any legislative provision, and the other type that results from government regulation.

Mr. Shope drew attention to section 21 of the Bantu Laws Amendment Bill, submitted in 1969, which would empower the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development to prevent African workers from doing any specific work for any specific employer in any specific place. He commented that this provision would make the Minister a virtual dictator of African labour and deprive the African worker of such little security of tenure as was left to him.

(iii) *Salaries.*—Miss McAnally supplied statistics concerning mining wages to show the inequality of salary levels between Africans and whites. The monthly average salary was:

Africans	\$21
Whites	364

(iv) *Safety measures and workmen's compensation benefits.*—The attention of the Working group was drawn to the recent mine disaster at Buffelsfontein Gold Mines, Klerksdorp, Transvaal, by a letter of 13 Nov-

ember 1969 from the Management Committee of SACTU. It was reported that sixty miners (fifty-eight Africans and two whites) had been buried alive. The communication from SACTU states:

"The following are the main disabilities that affect African miners:

"Lack of safety precautionary measures for African miners;

"Denial of trade union rights to African miners who would otherwise fight for improvement of their wages, working conditions and social security and benefits;

"In terms of apartheid laws, African families or dependents whose breadwinners have lost their lives in such accidents are left without compensation—except the £180 which is sometimes paid in lump sums—after which they are forced to remain without additional assistance for the rest of their lives. On the other hand, white miners' families get assistance not only from Chamber of Mines, but also from the State and the Special Fund of the White Mineworkers' Union.

"As we have pointed out time and time again in the past, the perpetrators of this inhuman system are nurtured and encouraged by foreign investments, mainly from the United Kingdom and the United States of America, whose main concentration is in the mining industry in South Africa.

"As you may be aware, the Unemployment Insurance Amendment Act No. 87 of 1968 raised the maximum level earnings, in respect of which contributions are payable to the Unemployment Insurance Fund, from R 3,120 a year to R 3,536. African mine workers and all African workers earning less than R 546 a year are excluded.

"Victims of accidents and tuberculosis and invalids are invariably sent back to the so-called 'Bantu Homelands' and those who glean any benefits at all receive it in very small amounts, and as soon as they die such payments are immediately abrogated.

"During the period of December 1967 to October 1968, the Government gazetted a list of persons, to whom sums of money had been owing for more than a year under the Workmen's Compensation Act, containing a record number of 19,200 names of people who could not be traced and 80 per cent of these were Africans."

The absence of any form of forced labour or slavery

The Group received detailed information on the labour conditions in the so-called "Native Reserves" or "Bantu Homelands" and on the system of migratory labour under which Africans are recruited from the reserves to work in industrial areas under temporary "contracts".

(i) *Employment opportunities and labour conditions in the reserves.*—Several witnesses, including Dr. Conco and Miss McAnally, pointed out that only 12 per cent of the land is reserved for "non-whites" who make up about 80 per cent of the population, and that most of the reserves are situated in barren, desolate areas where unemployment and poverty are prevalent.

According to various studies, the economy of the Transkei and other reserves rests in practice on subsistence farming, under difficult conditions and on the earnings of migratory workers. According to the *Annual Report of the Transkei Government for 1967* (page 45), there were during that year only 32,700 Africans gainfully employed in the Transkei, 46 per cent in Government offices, 28 per cent in domestic services and 17 per cent in commerce. Their total cash earnings per year were estimated at about R 4 million. The rest of the 257,586 Transkelians employed in the whole of the Republic of South Africa were migratory labourers temporarily outside the Transkei in the mines, sugar plantations and manufacturing industries.

(ii) *Border industries.*—Dr. Conco described the establishment of border indus-

tries on the white side of the borders of the "Bantu homelands" as having a dual purpose: to utilize the excess labour and to stop the influx of labour into the towns. The witness said that the reserves are meant to be reservoirs of cheap labour for border area industries. As an inducement to white entrepreneurs, those who establish industries in the border areas are given cheap loans, tax concessions, rail rebates and other concessions. Mr. Mbata stated that these border industries were not bound by wage determinations applicable to urban areas and accordingly paid Africans lower wages. Border industries also differed from urban industries in that they might not have the facilities for providing accommodation for the African workers, on the grounds that the Africans could commute daily. It was also said, however, that the distances between the reserves and the border industries varied but some were up to 200 miles apart, and that those workers who had to travel long distances to the border industries were reduced in fact to the status of migrant labourers.

(iii) *The migratory labour system.*—As explained in the ILO report and in Mr. Shope's testimony, under the Bantu Labour Regulations (Rural Areas) of 1968, every African in the reserves is compelled to register at a tribal Labour Bureau as a "work seeker". The tribal bureaux pool all "work seekers" in their respective areas and provide labour as and when requested by employers in white areas. Mr. Shope described the operation of this system and said that an African worker is obliged to contract himself to an employer for a period of not more than twelve months or 364 shifts, and at the end of that time he is to return to his "homeland" where he has to reapply for a new contract. Even if his employer wanted to keep him in continuous employment, the policy of the Government denies the employer the right to keep an African worker for a continuous period exceeding one year. The ILO report states that the aim of those regulations is to ensure that the reserves will continue to remain pools of cheap labour for the industrial areas, and at the same time, that the migratory labourers will not establish themselves permanently in urban areas.

According to Mr. Shope and other evidence, several measures are taken to ensure that only the Africans who perform "useful" labour for whites and ultimately only African migratory workers remain in urban areas. It was recalled that, under section 10 of the Bantu (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act of 1945, as amended, no Bantu may remain for more than seventy-two hours in those areas unless he produces proof that he has since birth resided there continuously or that some other restrictive conditions are met. The unfit, the widows and some others may be disqualified otherwise under section 28 of the Act as "redundant Bantu". Further, even if the African meets the conditions laid down in section 10, he may be prohibited from living in an urban area as an "idle" or "undesirable" Bantu if he refuses without "reasonable cause" to accept employment offered by Labour Bureaux or on various other grounds (section 29). Any African who fails to show his reference book to any officer on demand, or whose reference book is not in order, may be also "endorsed out" of urban areas, under the Pass Laws. Mr. Shope stated that these laws are rigorously applied: by 24 August 1966, 193,985 Africans had been resettled in rural areas under the influx control laws, and from 1 July 1965 to 30 June 1966, about 850,000 Africans had been prosecuted under those laws. As explained in chapter XI of the report of the Working Group under resolution 21 (XXV), Africans expelled from urban areas are "resettled" in the reserves or in large numbers in transit camps. From these resettlement areas, they can subsist usually only by becoming migratory labourers under temporary contracts.

Several witnesses, in particular Dr. Dennis in his 1968 testimony and Mr. Shope have emphasized the elements of compulsion in the migratory labour system. Africans are compelled to seek work through the Labour Bureaux, and refusal to accept the employment offered, without reasonable cause (as determined by the Bureaux), leads to the African being declared an "idle" or "undesirable" person and, as such, to his possible detention in rural villages or other resettlement areas (transit camps) to perform labour (Bantu (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act, 1945, as amended, section 29).

(iv) *The condition of Africans in agricultural and domestic employment.*—It was said by Mr. Carstens that African workers in the white rural areas are reduced to virtual serfdom and cannot leave their place of employment without the permission of their employers. Mr. Shope also pointed out that under the Master and Servant Laws it was a criminal offence for an African who has agreed to take a job not to do so, or to take steps to change his occupation before the expiry of his contract. Once an African has taken a position, he has no right, even if he can be offered another job by another employer who pays better, to leave that post and he must work until his contract expires. In the year ending 30 June 1966, there were 22,800 Africans prosecuted for those offences.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Under the Transkei Constitution Act, labour matters fall within the "self-governing powers" of the Territory. However, says the fifth special report of the Director General of the ILO, "It may be supposed that special arrangements will also be concluded as regards the control of labour from the Transkei."

² The Bantu Laws Amendment Act was enacted in 1970, after the completion of the present report. (Editor).

³ "South Africa: Workers under Apartheid," by Alex Hepple, International Defence and Aid Fund, London 1969, page 72.

⁴ A leader of the South African Congress of Trade Unions. (Editor).

⁵ The case against the 22 Africans collapsed in February 1970. They were, however, detained immediately under the Terrorism Act. (Editor).

⁶ "South Africa: Workers under Apartheid," p. 74.

⁷ The Bill was enacted in 1970.

⁸ Gwendolyn Carter, *South African Transkei: the Policies of Domestic Colonialism*, London, Heinemann, 1967, p. 79.

⁹ See, for instance, *South Africa: Resettlement, the New Violence to Africans* (International Defence and Aid Fund, 1969), p. 16.

THE U.N.—POVERTY AND POLLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the UAW continues its international affiliation with the UNO in cosponsoring world poverty teach-ins—see my remarks of June 16, 1970, page 20062.

The international socialist's slogan of taking from those who have and giving to those nations who have not seems now to be converted into a world poverty program—so long as Americans pay and Americans lose.

Many Americans may question why a labor organization is funding and in

league with the international combine. The answer may lie in the old maxim that the policies of the monarch are those of his creditors—it must apply to international labor organizations also.

I insert a newsclipping as follows:

POVERTY IS POLLUTANT, U.S. SYMPOSIUM TOLD
(By A. F. Mahan)

ONAWAY, MICH.—Poverty and deprivation are among the most dangerous forms of pollution and their elimination should be given high priority, an American labor leader told a United Nations' symposium on "man's environment" here today.

Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers Union, also told the representatives of 27 nations that "without a vigorous push for an economy of equal opportunity and distributive justice, the chances for environmental sanity may well be lost."

Woodcock said much of what passes for environmental clean-up in the United States is limited to "the cosmetic approach for beautification."

He said sweeping of streets, picking up of litter and returning disposable bottles are wholesome pursuits, but do not go to the heart of the matter.

From the standpoint of the poor and deprived of the cities, he said, "such actions are frivolous, middle class evasions of the need to end deprivations and poverty."

He told the 110 U.N. delegates and labor leaders that the greatest hope for avoiding total disaster lies in the new generation. "Rather than attempting to silence them . . . we should prepare to join them in advancing toward a new way of perceiving and organizing the world community," he declared.

The UAW is cosponsor with the U.N. of the symposium, described as a prelude to the U.N.'s 1972 environmental conference in Stockholm, Sweden.

NONRECORD VOTES

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in a very short time the House will consider the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. This bill will affect every piece of legislation this body considers for years to come.

In today's Wall Street Journal, Mr. Norman C. Miller, who has written some very fine articles on the subject of congressional reform and reorganization, addresses the subject of nonrecord votes. I think the article will be of interest to House Members.

The article follows:

SOME IN HOUSE SEEK TO END OLD PRACTICE OF NONRECORD VOTING—VOTE ON BID TO END ANONYMITY IS LIKELY TO BE ANONYMOUS; STUDENT GROUPS HIT PRACTICE

(By Norman C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—In England centuries ago, members of Parliament fearful of the king's wrath developed a system of voting to mask their individual actions; votes were not recorded by name. In 1832, when Parliament no longer had reason to fear the king, the system was reformed to provide a public record of how individual members vote.

But the system of nonrecord voting, avoiding a roll call, lives on in the U.S. House of

Representatives; the House borrowed its procedures from Parliament but never got around to copying reforms the British made 138 years ago. Today, crucial votes on such vital issues as the antiballistic missile, the supersonic transport and Vietnam policy are cast under various cloaks of anonymity, such as voice votes, that allow Congressmen to escape accountability to the public. In the Senate, by contrast, any member can force a roll call vote on any issue.

Now, however, there's a flurry of interest in proposals to force House members to cast record votes on all important matters before them. The move for change is enlisting Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives.

Leaders of the Democratic Study Group, which includes more than 100 liberals, are promising an "all-out effort" to revise the voting system. "The whole question of non-record voting greatly disturbs me," says Michigan Rep. James O'Hara, a DSG leader who's advocating voting reforms as part of his campaign for the job of House Majority Leader. "We shouldn't have important amendments rejected without a record vote," he says.

Democratic Rep. Joe Waggoner of Louisiana, a conservative, says he favors more record votes because they would force House members "to become a bit more acquainted with the legislation under consideration and to give some thoughtful consideration to some of these good amendments."

A conservative Republican, Rep. Charles Gubser of California, says his interest in reform has been stimulated by student groups that complained about nonrecord votes. "The charge of secrecy is a valid one," he declares.

"RECEIVED YOUR STUPID LETTER"

As things stand now, votes are recorded by name on final House passage of a bill and on a motion to recommit a measure to committee, but only occasionally on a proposed amendment to legislation. Soon, when a Congressional reorganization bill reaches the House floor, a bipartisan reform group will seek to change House rules to require more record votes. But even if that move fails, lobbyists for peace groups, conservation organizations and other outfits plan to expand efforts to watch nonrecord votes on the House floor and to publicize unofficial records of individual members' positions. Howls of protest are likely to result.

Some Congressmen reacted furiously when antiwar lobbyists recently published their nonrecord votes on key amendments offered by doves to a defense bill. One lobbyist quotes this letter an outraged House member wrote to the group:

"I received your stupid letter in which you indicated that your snoopers who were sitting in the House gallery during debate on the military procurement bill recorded me as being absent on five different (non-record) votes. May I tell you that I was present for each of those votes and if these people were unable to identify me, then it is their own responsibility."

Perhaps significantly, the Congressman didn't take the opportunity to set the record straight on how he did vote. And under the current system, there's no way to be sure.

SITTING AS A COMMITTEE

The nonrecord voting occurs when the House is (technically) sitting as a committee while amending bills. This device is used to speed up proceedings, and no roll calls are taken. Instead, the amendments are decided by voice votes, by "divisions" in which members stand up to be counted or by "teller votes" in which members march up the center aisle in "yea" and "nay" lines. In no case is an official record made of how individuals vote.

If an amendment fails at this point, it's

necessary to overcome difficult Parliamentary hurdles to obtain a later roll call vote when the House resumes its regular session before taking final action. As a practical matter, it's seldom possible to get a roll call vote on important amendments that are rejected during the House's "committee" deliberations. The system is heavily weighted against insurgents.

Moreover, the single roll call vote that is allowed on a motion to recommit a bill to committee has lost much of its meaning on several recent issues. In a recent floor fight over the ABM, the House GOP leadership arranged for a misleading recommittal motion that would have killed all funds for the missile system instead of just deployment funds—although deployment is the real issue. Predictably, the motion was snowed under because almost everyone favors continued ABM research funds, but the GOP leaders were happy because they had blocked an effort to have a vote on deployment funds alone.

The Parliamentary shrouds that cover many key votes in the House also allow members to abandon positions they have pledged publicly to support. "Everybody knows that there have been times when the leadership urged people to take a walk during a critical teller vote to prevent an amendment from being adopted," says Rep. Waggoner.

Furthermore, it isn't unusual for Congressmen who have publicly favored an amendment to vote against it during non-record proceedings in order to curry favor with powerful chairmen who oppose the amendment. And the lack of record voting encourages high absenteeism during the vital amending process; important proposals are frequently decided with less than 100 of the 435 members participating.

Even highly publicized issues can be settled by a relatively small number of Congressmen. Less than half the House members voted on a recent amendment proposing to kill funds for the SST; the amendment was defeated on a 107-86 teller vote. Some anti-SST Congressmen believed they would have won on a record vote, which presumably would have resulted in a bigger turnout.

"Every public-opinion poll shows that people are overwhelmingly opposed to the SST, and I am confident the House would have reflected that opposition on a record vote," says Democratic Rep. Henry Reuss of Wisconsin.

Whether or not record tallies would change some votes, a growing number of Congressmen are advocating rules changes that would provide the electorate with a better record of their Congressman's positions on issues. A group of 40 Republicans and Democrats proposed the other day that roll call votes be made mandatory if requested by 44 members after defeat of an amendment on a non-record vote.

Other reformers would simply adopt the British system of having clerks record names of members, rather than merely count "yeas" and "nays," as they pass through teller lines. This proposal would save some of the time consumed by roll calls, which can take up to 45 minutes each. Reformers estimate it would take less than 15 minutes to record teller votes.

Still, the reformers will have a difficult time changing the voting rules when a Congressional reorganization bill reaches the floor in a few weeks. The Rules Committee, in writing the bill behind closed doors, rejected proposals for more record voting. Thus the reformers will be laboring under an ironic handicap: The floor vote on the record-voting issue will be taken, at least initially, on a non-record basis, making it easier for guardians of the status quo to duck the issue.

But pressures being exerted on Congressmen could conceivably push a majority behind reform of the voting system.

Some House members fear that refusal to

change would simply prompt more lobbying groups to watch the nonrecord votes from the galleries and publish possibly erroneous tabulations. Antiwar lobbyists say they do intend to continue vote-watching operations, and they profess unconcern about the possibility of error.

"Actually, the more mistakes we make, the more we bring home the point that record votes should be required," says one Congressional staffer who has been watching his bosses for a dovish group.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Congress has acted responsibly and constitutionally by lowering the voting age to 18. Not only the younger generation, but all of us, will be the better by conferring the vote to those below the age of 21. For many years, I have worked to lower the voting age—first in the State legislature and, more recently, since I entered the U.S. Congress. We need to channel the idealism, honesty, and their mature judgment into responsible political influences. By lowering the voting age to 18, we will encourage civic responsibility at an earlier age and thereby promote greater social involvement and political participation for our youth.

For many years, we have granted certain responsibilities to 18-year-olds. Many of these responsibilities are theirs without choice. They pay taxes, they marry, they make contracts, they drive cars, own guns; they are held criminally responsible like adults.

They go to war. At the very least, the opportunity to vote should be granted as a benefit in return for the risks an 18-year-old is obliged to assume when he is sent off to fight for his country. Approximately 30 percent of our forces in Vietnam are under 21. Over 19,000, or almost half of those who have died in action there, were under 21. What part did they play in the decision to fight in Indochina? Were they given an opportunity to express their views through the ballot? Obviously the answer in all but four States is no. Can anyone really maintain that these young men did not deserve the right to vote?

I realize that it is not the most politically expedient thing to do—especially when many older voters are fed up with occurrences such as Isla Vista—but by lowering the voting age, we are opening the decisionmaking process for many who now feel deeply frustrated. By being excluded from the process, our youth has had few alternatives to express their grievances. The young men and women of ages 18, 19, and 20—5 percent of our population—will be provided with a legitimate outlet for their concerns, while at the same time enabling them to participate in a mature manner within the established political framework of our Government.

THE PEOPLE VERSUS THE WAR

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the tradition of open debate has deep roots in the American way of life. As a Nation, we accept the proposition that the citizenry of a modern representative democracy is best able to decide any matter when there has been a clear-cut examination of the issues in an open forum by capable advocates for each point of view. Then the people can be the judge.

In my home city of Chicago, television station WMAQ-TV recently put this proposition to the test once more on the issue of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, which I am cosponsoring in the House as House Resolution 985. The resolution would limit defense expenditures in Vietnam over the coming year to those amounts required to carry out the safe and orderly withdrawal of all American troops by June 30, 1971, and would prohibit expenditure of Defense Department funds for U.S. combat or support troops in Laos and Cambodia. It is popularly known, for good reason, as "the amendment to end the war."

On the evenings of Wednesday, May 13, and Friday, May 15, in each case at 10:30 p.m., WMAQ-TV broadcast, respectively, an editorial in support of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, and then a rebuttal. Each broadcast was limited to a minute and one-half in length, and each invited viewers to write in to WMAQ-TV to express their opinions.

Over 11,000 persons responded, and their judgment was strikingly clear. Of a total of 11,094 responses, 10,425 or 94 percent supported the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. In my own Second Congressional District, 96 percent of the responses favored the amendment.

I find this unmistakable verdict against the war impressive but not surprising. I believe that the not-so-silent majority of our people wants an end to U.S. military involvement in Indochina at the earliest possible date.

I am inserting the WMAQ-TV letter of summary of this poll and their statistical analysis of the responses at this point in the RECORD:

JUNE 2, 1970.

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MIKVA: Nearly twelve thousand persons sent us their opinions of the Hatfield-McGovern Amendment ("the Amendment to End the War in Southeast Asia") in response to a WMAQ-TV editorial and an editorial rebuttal.

We received a total of 11,094 responses in letters, cards and petitions. Of that number, 10,425, or 94%, supported the Hatfield-McGovern Amendment.

Our editorial on May 13 asked for mail in support of the Amendment. A rebuttal on May 15 by Attorney John Hayner of Ottawa, Illinois, asked for mail opposing the Amendment. Both the editorial and the rebuttal were a minute and a half in length. Each was broadcast only once, at 10:30 p.m.

We sorted the mail by congressional district in compliance with our promise to inform Senators and Representatives of the response from the areas they represent. The attached sheet shows a breakdown by district. All mail from our viewing area in Indiana was included as one category. Mail from Wisconsin, Michigan and other locations not in our viewing area made up another category.

The mail was made available to you or your representatives today at WMAQ-TV in the Merchandise Mart at 3:00 p.m. In the event that you were not able to pick up the mail today, you can do so at a time convenient to you.

Some viewers sent money, apparently meant for the Amendment to End the War Committee. The money, a total of \$53.00, was forwarded to the Committee.

Sincerely,

BOB SMITH,
Editorial Director.

Congressional district	Total responses	Favor amendment	Oppose amendment	Percentage favoring amendment
1.....	290	290	0	100
2.....	730	701	29	96
3.....	323	309	14	96
4.....	657	593	64	91
5.....	280	254	26	91
6.....	398	373	25	94
7.....	128	123	5	96
8.....	256	243	13	95
9.....	1,451	1,419	32	98
10.....	924	892	42	95
11.....	1,416	1,370	46	97
12.....	738	680	58	92
13.....	1,674	1,587	87	95
14.....	706	643	63	91
15.....	418	332	86	79
17.....	182	155	27	85
Indiana.....	316	273	43	83
Miscellaneous (Wisconsin, Michigan, downstate Illinois, other States.....)	207	198	9	95
Total.....	11,094	10,425	669	94

SUMMARY OF POLL

This is a report on some mail response from our viewers. In a recent editorial, we endorsed the amendment proposed by Senators Hatfield and McGovern to gradually cut off military funds for the war in Southeast Asia. And in that editorial, we asked those viewers who agreed with our stand to send us a letter. We promised to make all the letters known to our Senators and Congressmen.

We also broadcast a rebuttal to the editorial. It was delivered by an attorney named John Hayner. He opposed the amendment and asked that those people who agreed with his position write to this station.

We have counted and sorted all the mail, and as you'll see here, representatives of Senators Charles Percy and Ralph Smith, and representatives of the Congressmen in this viewing area have acknowledged the mail and taken it to their offices.

And here's the final tally. There were 10,671 responses from Illinois. Of that total, only 622 people were opposed to the amendment. That means that 94% of the people who responded from this state are in favor of cutting off military funds to support the war.

We also got 423 responses from viewers in Wisconsin, Indiana and Michigan, and 89% of those people supported the amendment.

The Illinois Congressional District with the heaviest response was the north suburban 13th, represented by Congressman Phillip Crane. And, of the 1,674 people who wrote in from the 13th District, 95% favored the stop-the-war amendment.

In Chicago proper, the heaviest responses came from the north and northwest sides.

We are not pretending that this is a scientific sampling of anti-war feeling. But 94% of the people who cared enough to respond have made it clear that they've had enough of the war in Southeast Asia.

(This editorial was broadcast at various times on Friday, May 29 and Saturday, May 30, 1970).

STUDENT ESSAY ON AMERICANISM

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the profound concern of America's young citizens is shown by the following essay which I have been asked to insert in the RECORD. Entitled "This Is My Country," it is the winning Americanism essay of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Wisconsin for 1970. It is submitted by Louise Sjoerdsma, 527 North High St., Randolph, Wis. Louise is an 11th grade student at Meadow Wood High School, Randolph, Wis.:

THIS IS MY COUNTRY

"This is my country! Land of my birth!
This is my country! Grandest on earth!
This is my country! Land of my choice!
This is my country! Hear my proud voice!"

The words of this song, written by Don Raye, carry a very important message, a message of love for and pride in the United States of America. Listening to these words, you can almost see the tear streaked and beaming face of an immigrant as he stands for the first time on American soil. Or rather, you may visualize a small boy, born and reared in the United States, struggling through his history lesson, his eyes opening wide in disbelief as he reads that not all children enjoy the same privileges that he enjoys. And suddenly you feel a deep sense of pride that you are an American.

What makes Americans feel such pride in their citizenship? Evidently they like freedom and self-government and the principle of right and justice upon which our country is founded. It makes them feel good to know that the government exists of them, and for them. They are proud to be called by the name of such a country.

Today, as never before, America is depending upon its citizens to help conquer seemingly insurmountable problems. America needs very capable leadership today. It is up to its citizens, who take pride in their country, to support and vote for, leaders who will act. The daily newspapers are proof enough that action must be taken soon. Destructive riots, racial prejudices, drug abuse, water and air pollution, rising crime rates, over-population, all of these and more, though not providing very pleasant reading, make headlines every day. America needs a concerned citizenry, a citizenry that will not only appreciate democratic government, but will work to preserve it. As John F. Kennedy once said, "... In a democracy, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics, holds office; everyone of us is in a position of responsibility; and in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends upon how we fulfill these responsibilities."

Will our children be able to assert their citizenship with the same pride that we assert ours today? Or are we going to fail America by sitting back, placidly watching the decline of the greatest and grandest nation on earth. It's time that we leave the ranks of the silent majority and speak out

for our country. Now is the time to preserve the ideas for which our forefathers fought. Stand up and be counted. By accepting this challenge, all of us will be doing our part to make America an even greater nation than it is today, a nation respected and trusted by other countries. We can help build a nation that future generations will be proud to claim as their homeland. Yes, This Is My Country, "to have and to hold!"

KEYSERLING ON THE PENN CENTRAL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of June 16, 1970, carried a letter from Mr. Leon H. Keyserling in which the former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers discusses the Penn Central Railroad situation.

I found Mr. Keyserling's comments to be of great interest and I insert the text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KEYSERLING ON THE PENN CENTRAL

How right is your editorial of June 12, observing that the current Penn Central Railroad situation must "stimulate second thinking about the efficiency of mergers." The erroneous public decisions which approved this merger should prompt further consideration of the public interest, before a government which "cannot afford" to help adequately our public schools pumps about 200 million dollars into helping a 7 billion dollar corporation (which owns a tremendously costly new luxury resort at Boca Raton) to continue its wrongful course.

For several years beginning in 1961, I opposed the Penn Central merger before the ICC. I said that the alleged financial crisis of the two roads, while serious, was grossly exaggerated and accompanied by some legerdemain; that this financial trouble was due predominantly to bad management and could be rectified only by improved management and an about-face in railroad policy; that the so-called financial crisis was caused largely by the high sensitivity of rail traffic to economic stagnation and recession 1953-1960, and would be alleviated by an acceptable rate of economic growth (note such effects 1960-1966, and the converse 1966 to date); that the claim that the merger would rescue "weaker" roads, such as the New Haven, was star-gazing; that the merger was deliberately contrived to achieve spurious "savings" by drastic curtailment of service rather than to achieve the efficiencies and enlarged service which might justify a mammoth merger; and that approval of the merger would propitiate the very mistakes just listed.

The ICC approved the merger, accepting as gospel the findings of the two roads and their independent experts, even though, as of the date of approval, these findings had been discredited completely by actual events. So today, Penn Central is "broke"; management is discredited; passenger service is being ruinously suspended.

When the case first went to the Supreme Court, where I again appeared in opposition to the merger, the Court by a 5 to 4 vote sent the case back to the ICC for further consideration of the prime legislative standard of adequacy of service. But when the case came back to the Court, the merger was

unanimously approved in an opinion so concerned about whether several contending railroads got a fair break that it barely dealt with the paramount issue of adequate service. Indeed, the Court could not have faced this issue and approved the merger, for the ICC's attention to this issue was fragmentary and farcical.

Today, the public interest needs champions. When I opposed the merger before the ICC, it was also opposed by the Department of Justice in a 288-page brief, the Council of Economics Advisers, an interdepartmental committee established by President Kennedy, the Railway Labor Executives Association, and in part by the Port of New York Authority. But finally before the Supreme Court, all this opposition changed to support, even though the financial condition of the roads had greatly improved. A book examining this great sea-change would provide a rare story of weakness and, in some instances, venality.

LEON H. KEYSERLING.

WASHINGTON.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the consideration of House Resolution 914, the House voted in a package deal to lower the voting age to 18 and to adopt the other Senate amendments to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

If the voting age is to be lowered—and I would favor some lowering of the age limit—it should be lowered by constitutional amendment. On the basis of the provisions of article I, section 2 of the Constitution, it has always been assumed that States held the constitutional authority to set voting age requirements and that the Federal Government could assume this power only on the strength of a constitutional amendment. While the Federal Government does have power under the 14th amendment to step in and alter State voting requirements found to deny "equal protection of the laws," whether denial of the vote to those citizens 18 through 20 years of age constitutes such an act of discrimination is certainly open to debate. This measure is, I am sure, headed for lengthy and complicated litigation in our courts. It should be considered in the courts immediately, and I am told, will be as all parties want a definite decision.

Moreover, the assumption of the Federal Government of this power over voting requirements serves to limit the free choice of the people of our States in deciding the issue for themselves.

Accordingly, in an effort to separate the voting age issue from the rest of the Senate amendments to the Voting Rights Act, I voted against the motion for the previous question. This could have allowed the two sections to be judged on their individual and separate merits.

When this failed, however, I did vote for the voting rights bill and the voting age section. The alternative was rather clear: It meant voting against the entire bill, which would have delayed and en-

dangered passage of the Voting Rights Act as a whole. The 1965 act expires the first week of August.

Mr. Speaker, we needed the Voting Rights Act. And we need to allow the States the right to set their voting age limit. I would have preferred to allow the States to determine if that State wanted to lower its voting age.

I do not quarrel with the validity of the argument that our young people are better educated and more attuned to the times today than they were a generation ago. I do wonder about the magic of the age 18; I do wonder if perhaps we could have accomplished just as much at lowering the voting age to 19 or 20; and I still think it would have been better to allow the States to determine this limit. I question if Congress has the constitutional right to change this by statute. Hopefully, this can be brought before the courts in rapid order.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the last war all enslaved peoples in Europe hoped to regain their freedom and forget their sufferings. Some did attain their goal, but some 100,000,000 others were robbed of that most precious of their possessions by the men in the Kremlin. Since then the Soviet Government has become the captor and jailor, the oppressor and tormenter of these peoples in Central and Eastern Europe.

As a matter of historic fact, even before the end of that war, some peoples in Eastern Europe and in the Baltic countries had already been drawn within the Soviet Union's deadly network. But at the time both these victim peoples and their sympathizers in the West had hoped that soon after the war these peoples would be freed. Unfortunately, events took a decidedly different and ominous turn, and the western statesmen, instead of succeeding in their efforts to free these peoples, witnessed the enslavement of more millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain erected between East and West by the Soviet Union. Then these helpless and unfortunate souls were effectively, once and for all cut off from the free world; they became Soviet satellites, the captive nations in Europe today.

For more than 25 years the statesmen of the West have made innumerable attempts to better the conditions under which these captive nations live, and have also worked through diplomatic negotiations for the welfare and well-being of these peoples. But all efforts to that end, often led by the Government of this Republic, have come up against the unbending and unreasonable stand of the Soviet Government. Even against such ill success, however, we have not ceased to work for the freedom and independence of these peoples. We have not allowed the world to forget that the Soviet

Union is the cause of the suffering and enslavement of these peoples, and until their freedom, Soviet leaders do not have the right to speak in behalf of these oppressed peoples. We have vowed to continue our efforts in behalf of the captive nations. During the Captive Nations Week we will once more let the court of world public opinion know that the cause of these peoples is a sacred and humane one, and it is the duty of all free peoples to champion the righteous cause of all captive nations.

McKEESPORT, PA., TROOP 9

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, over the past 60 years millions upon millions of our Nation's youth have benefited from the training and guidance received as members of the Boy Scouts of America. The organization enjoys a well-deserved reputation for its service to God and country. But last month, in McKeesport, Pa., Troop 9 added a new luster to this outstanding record.

Troop 9 is sponsored by the Burt Foster Post 361, American Legion, in McKeesport, and it is comprised of mentally handicapped youths. Yet, on May 21, two of its members, Edward and Charles Hopper, sons of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Hopper of 1728 Federal Street, attained the highest rank in scouting—the Eagle award.

Mr. Roy Bramhall, scout commissioner for the Yohogania Area Scout Council with more than 20 years' service in scouting, believes it is the first time youths with this handicap have achieved the Eagle rank. "I have been in scouting 23 years," Mr. Bramhall said. "I know how hard a normal boy has to work to get the Eagle award. These boys spent twice as many hours and worked twice as hard. These boys only want a chance, not pity."

Mr. Speaker, certainly special recognition should be given Edward and Charles Hopper. They, and their parents, should be justifiably proud of what has been accomplished; not only because of their individual achievement but for the example they have set for other, less fortunate, youngsters. American Legion Post 361, under its commander, C. Elrod Lenhart, also should be commended for its interest and work with the handicapped youth. Troop 9, the Hopper brothers, the Scout leaders, and the sponsoring organization reflect credit upon the Boy Scouts of America, the American Legion and the American people.

The Legion Post organized Troop 9 in 1956 and since then 300 to 350 boys have come under the influence and guidance of men such as Mr. Bramhall, Robert Brant, Edwin Coulter, Donald Kovacevic, Edward Matwig, Charles Coulter, Frank Ulton, George Mellinger, and the father of the new Eagle Scouts, Edward Hopper, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot properly express the pride I feel that such men, and the youths they guide toward manhood, are representative of the caliber of people who live in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

OLD GLORY SPEAKS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday millions of people across the country celebrated Flag Day in tribute to our flag.

In the Scottish Rite magazine, New Age, there appeared an inspiring tribute to the flag, by Amos F. Hurley, under the title, "Old Glory Speaks," which was reproduced in the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., on Saturday, June 13, 1970.

This is an excellent article and I would like for it to be reprinted for the benefit of readers of the RECORD:

OLD GLORY SPEAKS

I am the flag of the United States of America.

I was conceived in the dreams of liberty and in the hopes of freedom. I was designed by the hands of Betsy Ross and her sewing basket was my cradle. Though I was never an orphan, I was adopted by the Continental Congress in 1777 and proclaimed the national emblem of a Nation newly born on this continent, fighting valiantly for survival and destined to bring to all mankind a new concept of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I have been many places and have seen many things. I have witnessed every event of American history. I was there when they fired the shot heard 'round the world. I was there in the late twilight at Fort McHenry and inspired Francis Scott Key to write the immortal "Star-Spangled Banner," now our national anthem.

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

I saw Molly Pitcher take the cannon swab from the hands of her dead husband and help carry on the fight for freedom. I felt the biting cold at Valley Forge, and gave warmth and comfort to General Washington and his tired and hungry Continental Army.

I rode with Ethan Allen and the Green Mountain Boys, saw the signal that started the midnight ride of Paul Revere.

I was flown above the decks of *Old Ironsides*, and from the masts of the Yankee and the China Clippers. I blazed the trail with Daniel Boone and Davy Crockett. I led the settlers coming West and crossed Death Valley in a covered wagon.

LINK OF CHAIN

I am many things to many people, I am an inseparable link in the chain that binds men to God and country each link welded in the fires of purity by the Sacred Hands of God, Himself. And because I am on the side of God, the godless would destroy me, but they dare not, because I am protected by the mighty land armies of the Nation, the powerful and deadly fleet of the Navy and the screaming eagles of the Air Force, watching and waiting to swoop down and destroy anything that could harm me.

To some, I am yesterday, today and tomorrow; to others I am a glorious child, to some a grand old man or a most gracious lady. I have several names, I am called the "Red, White and Blue," "The Star-Spangled Ban-

ner," "The Stars and Stripes," but I am most commonly known by a nickname given me by an old sea captain, who called me "Old Glory."

GLORY OF MARINES

I was carried through the Halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli by the United States Marines. Once I fell to the ground at Custer's Last Stand and there were no living hands left to pick me up. I galloped up the slopes of San Juan Hill with Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders. I stayed with the boys until it was over, over there, and on the battlefields of the Marne, Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel and the Argonne forest. I saw many of the youths and manhood of our Nation fall and lie still in deaths. They had given their last full measure of devotion. The war was over for them forever, and I kept my lonely vigil over their graves and stayed to watch the poppies grow amid the crosses, row on row, in Flanders Fields. I was raised by five brave men during the "Hell" of Iwo Jima. I waved farewell to the four immortal chaplains who went down with their ship and to honored glory.

I have not changed much in my one hundred and ninety-two years. I still have my original 13 stripes, but as each State came into the Union a new star was proudly added to the constellation of my blue field. It started with 13 stars, now there are 50.

Many more things I would like to tell you, but we haven't time, but I do want to see you again. I am easy to find. I am everywhere. I am in the homes of the poor, in the mansions of the rich, in Independence Hall with the Declaration of Independence and the Liberty Bell, I am in the White House with the President, I am in all the churches, cathedrals, and synagogues, in the Council of the Boy and Girl Scouts of America, in all the schools where they pledge allegiance to me.

I draped the caskets of our Nation's heroes, borne to their last resting place, the caskets of Presidents, generals, admirals, humble privates and the unknown soldier. Wherever free men gather, wherever there is justice, equality, faith, hope, charity, truth or brotherly love, there to, am I.

A short while ago I was flown over the Nation's Capitol, gazing proudly across the land of the free and waving to the homes of the brave; then I was lowered and given by a grateful Nation to a great Congressman, who brought me across the continent to the shores of the Pacific and presented me to a group of veterans of World War I at Patriotic Hall in the City of the Angels to become their official flag and with fitting ceremonies, was carried by tired old hands and posted in a place of honor near the Holy Bible and there I shall remain until (like the old soldier) I'll just fade away and be retired by time alone and may history never write my obituary for I am the Stars and Stripes Forever.

I am Old Glory!

SELF-CONTROL NEEDED IN THIS PERIOD OF TRANSITION

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, there is a mood in this country that seems to suggest that people can do things better if they are forced to do them. Those who urge wage and price controls are the chief prophets of that mood. They are convinced that only dogmatic, dictatorial, despotic wage and price controls can cure our economic ills.

I will not pause here to examine the psychological complexities involved in such suggestions. The problem is more suitable for the psychiatrist's couch than the legislative chamber.

But one thing is certain: the President in his speech on the economy has urged not wage and price controls—but old-fashioned self-control. It probably will come as a shock to many of our "new" economists, but self-control is still a powerful factor in human affairs. Until we are all controlled by computers, charts, and graphs, it is the human being's self-determined action that will make this a better world. And the President, scorning wage and price controls—which, aside from being dictatorial, never works—knows the American people. He knows that we can and will use self-control to ease ourselves through this period of transition.

CRUSADE FOR MORALITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is little need for me to comment on the contents of the following address; it says it all. The speaker, Martha Rountree, originator of the internationally known "Meet the Press" program and political commentator, delivered these fighting remarks to approximately 2,000 delegates of the national convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in San Antonio, Tex., on June 10 of this year. It would behoove the Members of Congress to note well the action taken by the delegates of this 11 million-member organization for they voted unanimously to invite all other organized women's groups to join in their mobilization of "women power" to fight crime and corruption in the United States. Such a coalition, appealing to women of all political persuasions on a moral-over-political basis, could zero in on a current moral issue with the staggering potential of an estimated 45 million votes.

I understand the address was received with a spontaneous and heartfelt enthusiasm.

I would wager, judging from the contents of the speech and its reception, that the ladies are fighting mad.

I would caution that one of their sighted targets is the Congress of the United States.

May they, with that same Divine assistance which guided our Founding Fathers, enjoy instant and increasing successes.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY MARTHA ROUNTREE

Greeting: Madam President, honored guests, delegates, members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of America and the world.

It is a privilege to be able to participate in this convention. I hope and I pray that I may be able to find the right words and the right inspiration to convey to you certain thoughts I have which I believe can make

the big difference in the salvation of our country . . . at a time when I think you will all agree—we do have many serious problems.

Most of us remember the carefree days of our youth when the parks were fun places for the kids to play after school, when families looked forward to an evening at the movies, window shopping along the way back home, or a nice stroll after supper. These, and many other little innocent pleasures are not enjoyed by most of us who live in cities in this year 1970. We are afraid to be on the streets after dark.

CRIME

Last year there were—according to reports from police agencies throughout the United States—over 4,466,600 serious crimes in just the year 1968. These almost 4½ million crimes did not include close to a million automobile thefts. They did not include arson, petty larceny, burglaries which reached into the millions, robberies, aggravated assault and so on. They only included murders, rapes and brutalities. Kidnappings and hi-jackings came under additional statistics.

Police records show that a crime is committed every split second around the clock, day and night. And, as unbelievable as it may seem, the crime rate is getting worse, not better.

In 1968 the population rate here in the United States was up 11 percent, yet crime in the cities went up 122 percent. The chance of any of us becoming a victim of crime is much greater today than it was ten years ago. In fact, statistics show, as of this spring, that the risk of the American citizen becoming a victim of serious crime increased 16 percent in 1968 alone. 1970 is worse.

Home, often thought of as "Man's Castle" and looked upon as a sanctuary here in America can no longer be considered safe for women and children. It can be dangerous to be at home in 1970. Last year, 1969, daytime burglaries increased 247 percent over the 1960 figure. Kidnappings, rapes, murders, attacks on young children reached an all time high. Across the nation, small towns and big towns, few were exempt from danger.

This is unthinkable, unconscionable and unbelievable to most people. We have become so accustomed to reading about murder, rape, robberies, auto thefts, gangs, kidnappings, hi-jackings, wars, riots, communism, smut, dirt, pornography, dirty movies, dirty books, and even crime in the school house that we seem to have become immune to the very danger that lurks outside our own door. Or, could it be that decent people are suffering from a state of shock?

These things did not start happening all at once! They have been building gradually had plenty of warning but, like the war—had plenty of warning but, like the warnings we have had about the danger of communism infiltrating our communities, our schools, our churches, our government, our industries, our courts and in some instances even our press, radio and television, we just could not believe it could happen here. We just seemed to take it for granted that in spite of all we read and all we heard that things were not really that bad. We preferred to believe that those who pled with us to listen were alarmists, extremists or crack-pots.

Certainly, it was an easy and excusable attitude to take in view of the fact the enemy is a past master in the art of propaganda. At every turn we have been brainwashed over the last 25 years—brainwashed into believing we were not and are not seeing what we are seeing. Ordinarily we are too smart to be told that what we see is not there, most especially if we can also feel it. But, when things seem so impossible and we feel so alone—what can one person do? We can't go out and single handedly take on City Hall.

We feel an inner frustration, but so long as other people are just talking and no one is really doing anything, or so it seems, especially if there is no all out action, we finally come to the conclusion it can't really be all that serious. It is a normal assumption to make.

YOUTH

For years now Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has been warning us of the dangers that threatened the youth of our nation. All that is going on now on the campus, on the streets, in gangs and mobs is the result of a buildup that was plotted and planned a long, long time ago by the enemy and Mr. Hoover's agency knew it and we were warned over and over again.

Fifteen years ago we were told definitely and positively that dope traffic escalation was headed for the United States and that the target was "the youth of America." No one believed it. At least not enough of us believed it to be able to stop it. Here again it was so easy for the average family in the average American town or city to look the other way. It was so easy to reassure ourselves that it just could not happen in our part of the country. With a shrug, most people thought to themselves—"it is to be expected from the other side of the railroad tracks or—in the big city slums, but not to us." We know now that there are two sides to the railroad tracks. And, that we can also be on the other side. We know it can happen anywhere, because it has been happening everywhere.

Here again, the warnings have been constant since 1945. Your congressmen and your senators were told and informed and they could have done something. But unfortunately they did not do anything and their constituents did not demand that they do anything. A few of them tried, but it takes a majority in Congress and for reasons hard to believe, the majority of our elected officials most generally seem to side with all that is bad for us. Frankly, in view of the record of so many of them today it is hard to believe it is all accidental.

NARCOTICS

I remember so well—Commissioner Harry Anslinger's warning to the Congress of the United States and to the public in the 50's—Mr. Anslinger was the United States Narcotics Commissioner. He kept pleading with those in power to do something about the narcotics threat to this nation. Under oath he testified before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee in 1955 and told them that "the enemy and most especially Red China, had singled out the United States as a primary target for its illicit traffic in opium and heroin. He told them that the way things stood at that time, that without drastic action, that not even the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the Marines could stop the smuggling of narcotics into the United States." The United States Senate knew the danger, because the subcommittee that investigated the threat, told Congress the narcotic trafficking from the Chinese mainland and from North Korea was an insidious, calculated scheme of the Chinese Communist Regime to obtain operating funds and at the same time to spread the debauchery of narcotic addiction among the free nations, most especially the United States.

Our Government was warned. Congress was warned. We had all the evidence but no one would listen to Mr. Hoover, or to Mr. Anslinger. I have the proof of these warnings. In fact, I was editing a magazine at the time, and the entire story was published by our little magazine, but it got little coverage in the press. In fact, I cannot recall a single story being picked up on it, although we sent out hundreds of releases. We had expected it would be front page, and felt that we were really the Paul Revere of the year. I am sure many of you know the feel-

ing—when you are aware of something and try to alert someone and it all falls on dead air. Actually, that is the story of our plight today. Dead, polluted air seems to block out communication.

And so today we have lived to see dope traffic become big business in the United States. And, there is good reason to believe that many elected officials in many towns and cities give organized crime the protection needed to keep it flowing. All the crimes listed on all the police blotters in the U.S.A. cannot compare to the crime that has been dealt our young people. They have been duped into dope. Many of them have been destroyed beyond redemption. Children as young as five and six years of age have become victims. It is said that these children, including some teenagers do not always know when they take the first dose. It can be put in a soft drink, a piece of candy, even the all American brownie. We have read about party refreshments being treated with LSD. Evil has no limitation once allowed to run rampant.

A PROMISE COMING TRUE

Perhaps by now you are thinking—why beat an old dog? We know this—so what is the answer? But I submit to you that what history does not teach it must repeat. We cannot find a solution to the ills that confront us and confound us unless we are willing to examine in detail the symptoms.

I am sure we all remember Nikita Khrushchev's threat to bury us. However, this was not original with him. Karl Marx was the author in his early "Blue Prints for Conquest of the Free World."

There is an even more important threat which has been made by the Soviets and one we should not ignore. Back in the 30's a member of the Soviet hierarchy by the name of Jerome Livshitz, boasted that they would destroy the United States and its capitalistic system one day without a war. That most Americans were so naive and so stupid it would not be necessary or economical to fight us in open combat. When pushed for the answer the Soviet official replied—"It won't hurt to tell you because you still won't believe it or understand. But, he continued—it is all so very simple. We will just make you rotten" . . . "Rotten to the core!"

And—ladies, look around us today. A lot of what we see is rotten. Look at the marquees over many of the local theatres throughout the United States—did you ever believe the time would come when you would feel like driving out of your way to avoid passing a neighborhood theater—because you did not want your children to see the pictures posted or the advertisements? Because they are so shocking!

Look at a great deal of the television fare today. A lot of it is not only unfit for young people, but disgustingly nauseating to decent citizens. I would be embarrassed to describe some of the things I have tuned in on recently. The early morning NBC "Today" program. An early evening program on Washington's Metromedia channel five . . . to just name two. On one early morning program a couple of weeks ago, Hugh Downs suggested that young children should leave the room. On the other program, which I mention as one out of many examples on TV today—there was a televised meeting in a nudists camp and the script was horrible, the action was shocking, and I can't describe it, and I am not so unsophisticated that I am not aware of such things, but I am civilized enough and decent enough to be revolted. Even the newspapers today have taken up the cudgels for smut and dirt. One story appeared on page two of a New York newspaper on sex experiments recently. I could not and would not dare even read the printed story aloud to you in this convention. Run down the list of the newly pub-

lished books today and shudder. Read the reviews of some of the Broadway plays and other so called entertainment being offered the public. Read the national magazines and just check your newsstand and you will be shocked at the kind of filth and trash that is being offered for sale to anyone.

Everywhere we look and turn or look and read, we are finding smut, dirt, filth, vulgarity, perversion, homosexuality, abuses of every kind, crime, sadism, immorality and destruction of property and human values, dope is the kick of the times, vice has become respectable, young college girls and boys are cavorting on campus with the blessings of the faculties, David Susskind in NYC recently featured an hour program discussion between a group of young men and women, ages 18 to about 23 or 24 who were living together publicly and they were given the entire program time to explain why marriage was for the dopes. The list goes on and on. Only a month ago the Supreme Court ruled that a dirty movie which the people in Boston had ruled unfit to be shown there was legal and that it could be shown regardless of what the town folks thought. The list goes on and on and when and where it will end is going to depend on the action that is taken in the immediate months ahead.

You know when something starts rotting, the fibre rots too! In this case it is the moral fibre of our nation that is at stake. Is there anyone in his or her right mind who believes thousands and thousands of average American boys and girls from normal, healthy American homes in towns and cities from all over the United States, just all at once, all get the same identical impulse to start marching and throwing bricks, destroying and damaging public property, rioting and smoking pot, flaunting the enemy's flag and passing out L.S.D.? I don't believe it.

I believe it is happening—that is, that they are doing these things, but I do not believe it is the result of a mass impulse. I don't believe it is the signal for a revolution. I believe it is the end result of a concerted campaign staged by those who would destroy us, who have organized leaders going from campus to campus agitating and stirring up various groups to a point where the fever becomes contagious and the fact that everyone seems to be doing it at the time makes it all right to the immature and impressionable youth. The organizers know just how to arouse the kids. Regardless of whether the victims are actually guilty of wanting to do what they are doing—they are doing it. The result is the same. Along the way a lot of them get hurt, some permanently. The scars from dope and prison are ugly.

SUBVERSION

President Lyndon B. Johnson ordered an investigation of the ring leaders in the famed "March on the Pentagon" and the report revealed that most all of them were communists. The report was marked "Top Secret" and buried by the then Attorney General, Ramsey Clark. The reason given at the time was that he felt the revelation would just cause trouble. This report remains buried even today. Why?

The recent testimony of the F.B.I.'s Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, reveals that most all of the leaders of the campus disturbances are either inspired communists or anarchists. It names and identifies these trouble makers. Yet these facts are not to be found in the press reports. Your congressmen and senators know, or should know, all about this and they should be doing something about it. A reprint of Mr. Hoover's testimony, taken under oath, before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Appropriations, held March 5, 1970, was made public three and a half weeks ago. Few newspapers have seen fit to publish any of the shocking facts which this report contains. I have seen nothing about it on tele-

vision. Yet, the so called youth movement, the rioting, the threat of the long hot summer ahead commands constant coverage. Because of this does it not seem rather strange to you that the cause of it all should be kept such a deep, dark secret?

Incidentally, as further proof of the enemies' effort to discredit law and order in the United States, and to show where this influence starts—my sixteen year old daughter tells me that Mr. Hoover and his FBI has had a real job done on them all along the way. My daughter, a high school senior, tells that most of her school mates are suspicious of everything Mr. Hoover says. The image of this wonderful man is being destroyed by the enemy in order to render him and his agency helpless to protect us.

The Chief Judge of the family court in Providence, Rhode Island, the Hon. Edward P. Gallogly, in writing for the FBI law enforcement bulletin this month says:

The Communist Manifesto openly declares that communist ends can be attained only by the favorable overthrow of all existing social conditions.

Thus, the technique is to attack the law, to encourage antilegal approaches to all problems, and to destroy what has become known as "the establishment".

All major institutions are vulnerable to attack and are being attacked—religion, family, school, and even motherhood.

Today he says we have what they call the new morality.

They refuse to listen to any one but themselves, yet demand the right to free speech, which they deny to others.

They refuse to swear to uphold the Constitution yet run to it for cover every time their liberty is challenged.

They find no good in the system but offer no alternatives. They disparage thrift, parental honor, motherhood, marriage, purity, and offer us debauchery, obscenity, homosexuality and free love. And we are now reaping the harvest from the attempted imposition of their new morality.

All crime, adult and juvenile, is on the increase. People are afraid to walk the streets, people are afraid in their own homes. Suicides and death from drug use among college students have risen alarmingly in the last four years.

Groups of our society are forming into armed camps. Filthy movies designed only to excite erotic behavior in the viewer are being shown in family theatres, and may soon invade your homes on the television screens.

Movie stars defy convention and live together without the formality of old fashioned barbaric tribal rites, as they call marriage.

College presidents are imprisoned, belittled, and spat upon because some rowdy element wants its "rights". The chief judge of the family court of Rhode Island asks—"Should we be concerned". . . and answers . . . "If, we are not, then we are truly a silent majority".

COMMUNIST PARTY—U.S.A.

In 1965 the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the Smith Act was not legal. In fact it stated that "Communist Party members could invoke their constitutional privilege against self incrimination and refuse to register with the government as had been required by the Internal Security Act of 1950".

Result—the Communist Party considered this ruling a green light to become more active in mass agitation.

So, in June of 1966 the first 'out in the open', 'no holds barred' convention of the Communist Party U.S.A. was held at Webster Hall, 119 East 11th Street, N.Y.C. from 6/22 to 6/26 of that year. A transcript of that convention is a matter of congressional record and was reprinted in the Congressional Record and then made available to every single congressman and senator on Capitol Hill.

Communist speaker after speaker in that

convention took to the podium to emphasize that the party must stride boldly into the area of political action, run candidates for public office, participate in community decisions, meet and influence noncommunists.

Briefly, but to give you a thumbnail outline of what was decided at that first open convention—resolutions were passed to:

1. Initiate intensive programs to increase its influence in the labor field. To quote a part of the resolution, it read: "We can anticipate that the party using the slogan 'labor is the key issue' will make every effort to increase its recruitment of industrial workers".

The report is long, direct, to the point and does not pull any punches. I have a copy of the convention proceedings and can arrange to have a copy made available to the Federation, if you are interested.

Other resolutions, to touch on just a few called for racial strife. Another to use the cry for peace as a weapon to weaken our cause for victory in Vietnam.

Also, and most importantly: A concerted effort to recruit Puerto Ricans and to agitate for their independence. Also, to enlarge the Spanish section in the communist newspaper printed in this country and elsewhere.

A resolution was passed to agitate for action by the Indians. To stir them up and make them demand what should be theirs. We have seen this happen. Only last week there was serious trouble, as reported in some of the newspapers.

The important resolution that was passed at this convention said they would: "Concentrate on the youth of America. Organize campus protests and generally get students involved in the communist work. They would incite riots. Stir up the public vs. Vietnam. Convince draft age young men they were brave not to be drafted".

There is much more. Everything they voted to do at that convention they have just about done. I have a copy of the convention, all the resolutions here and what I have told you is actually in these minutes—this is a verbatim transcript.

In view of all this, it is most difficult to understand how some of our United States congressmen and senators, men in offices of public trust, have the unadulterated nerve to get up and condone the so called student unrest and even attempt to justify it.

INACTIVE CONGRESS

It is true that the Supreme Court made it possible for this upsurge of communist power in this country, but Congress still could have done something to have avoided the things that we are now talking about. For one thing, if the Court could find a flaw or loophole in the Smith Act, Congress could have passed another law and made sure it did not have any loopholes. They could even have passed a law to make the law that was thrown out legal. They could have taken on the Court if they had wanted. There are a lot of good lawyers in Congress. The problem is, there are not a majority of good legislators. Congress has the most power of any body in this country, and it enjoys this power because we give it to them. It is about time some of them got it taken away. The time is this coming November.

We all remember the controversial Soviet Consular Treaty. Congress passed it, and with the Court's decision to declare it was unconstitutional to force communists to declare themselves by registering as foreign agents. . . the enemy was now free to operate in the open. The grass roots of America became a ball park for Moscow. The increase in Soviet personnel in this country since 1966 has been unbelievable. The new figures on Soviet espionage and Soviet agents given in Mr. Hoover's report, which I showed you a few minutes ago, is shocking.

Here on the home scene, the President of the United States wrote a letter to the American Bar Association a few weeks ago asking for their help in trying to get some

kind of legislation through Congress to curb crime. He asked Congress for this legislation at the beginning of his term in 1969. Nothing happened. In his letter to Mr. Bernard G. Segal, the head of the Bar Association, he said "No major crime bill had reached his desk for signature" and that "the delay", as he put it "was inexplicable". He pled for help.

When the President took office he asked for a program which he felt met the needs of the time and one which he had promised the people in the United States. He was expected to deliver this program, yet no president can do anything if he is forced to wear congressional handcuffs.

1969 marks the only time in the history of this country when a president failed to get one single piece of the important legislation he asked Congress to give him. It is true a part of the draft bill got through, but not the reform bill he asked them to give him. It is true he got a small piece of legislation on crime, but nothing like the legislation that is needed to curb the crime that has enveloped this country.

Now it matters not whether you are a Democrat or a Republican—once an election is over the President of the United States' job is to serve the country first, and he cannot do this if his hands are tied by Congress. The President has asked for a major crime bill, over and over again. He asked for a draft reform bill, for electoral reform, postal reform, which we badly need, legislation to control the flow of narcotics, which should never have waited a single day, he asked for legislation to control the sale of pornography, smut and other allied commodities which need legal brakes. We asked for legislation to help the agricultural situation, for transportation, manpower sorely needed, welfare reform, social security geared to relate to inflation, manpower training, revenue sharing by states and so on. He got nothing. So, the American people got nothing.

For reasons which are hard to understand there are certain men in Congress who do not want to offend the radicals, the left, the right, the rioters and the members of organized crime. In the meantime things get worse. They are not going to get better until November. That is when the elections are held and after they get reelected some of them may make a few concessions. So Congress waits, but can we wait? Are we willing to wait? Will we wait? *The answer could be decided right here in San Antonio at this very convention.*

CONCLUSION

I did not come to San Antonio to talk politics but when the men we put into power are willing to pit that power against the welfare of the nation, then the issue becomes one of national emergency, not just politics.

I am a parent. My concern for the future of this country is two-fold, and I know that it is for everyone of you who has children or even grandchildren, and even if you are not fortunate enough to have children you are a part of a great country whose future is completely dependent upon our children today.

I know that your Federation has a number of important resolutions before this convention. Others are in various committees in your organization. They all deal with the very things I have been talking about this morning, and they are all so important it is difficult to know which one needs attention first. They all are urgently needed.

This year marks the 50th Anniversary of the Women's Suffrage Movement. Fifty years ago this year women got the vote. It was a big thing according to the records. They were going to clean house. They were going to show the men how to right wrong. As far as I can determine from all records of the past and all I have seen during my adult life these past 50 years can be considered years of failure. Women have not exercised their vote properly. It could be the greatest weapon

in the world against evil, but it has not even approached its potential.

Over the past fifty years we have lived through a second world war, emerged victorious against the enemy, rose to the position of the number one world power, and immediately began to forfeit it. We stood by and watched the Soviet Union, a broken and decimated nation in 1945 bluff us out of our position and responsibilities by slowly and gradually defeating us at every turn. We have watched one nation after another go down under the hammer and sickle. While the Soviet Union has been screaming colonialism to the free world they have been busy taking over as much of it as they can.

We need only look around the globe to see that every country in the world seems to be in some kind of serious trouble. We have two Koreas, two Berlins, two Chinas, two Vietnams and unless we are able to pry loose the wedge that seems to be slowly dividing this country we could live to see two U.S.A.'s. Consider the Berlin wall. The takeover of Cuba by Castro. The hi-jacking of the Pueblo. The price we have paid in both the Korean and Vietnam Wars. I have a brother in a veterans hospital as a result of the Korean War. He will never come home. There are American POWs in Chinese hell-holes today left over and forgotten from the Korean War. The war we could have won and chose to regard as a conflict. The suffering of today's POWs as a result of the Vietnam War is beyond human understanding and human endurance. I choke on my food every time I think of someone over there at this very moment being tortured by monsters who have no regard for humans.

All of this has resulted because of a Congress that was not big enough to represent the people of America, and the women could have changed it if they had gotten together and tried.

We have lived to see the very essence of Americanism put in jeopardy. We have lived to see the youth of America the victim of our own weaknesses.

We have lived to see the things that made us great gradually whittled away.

Only last week a circuit court judge in Annapolis, Maryland barred enforcement of a new law requiring daily flag salute exercises in all Maryland schools pending a court test of the measure's constitutionality. For the past six or seven years the big debate has been—is God dead? The enemy would have us believe that he is. And if we can believe it then we should ignore all that is happening and let the world blow itself up. It would not be worth saving.

However, we know God does exist. There is so much proof all around us. And knowing this we then know that we will have the right kind of help in fighting for those things which are right. You cannot count the petals of a daisy, or check the mathematics of the stars, the perfection of nature, the unerring design of human beings, the order of the universe from human beings to the leaves on the trees—the way things are put together and the way they all follow a certain pattern, and not see and know God's foresight—his greatness and his knowledge. There is order and design which can be proved not only scientifically but to the naked eye, and we cannot stand by and let a goddess enemy darken our perception towards the higher and worthier things in life. And with this knowledge must come faith. Faith that is needed by every woman in America. If we have faith and if we believe in the things that made us great, that brought us to the point where we even have a choice at this late hour then we can do something about the things which are troubling America and the world today.

First we can get your resolutions out in the open and we can get action on them. We can get action now.

You could not be meeting at a more propi-

tious time in our history, here in San Antonio this week this convention has brought together the leaders in just about every community in America. And I understand from other parts of the world as well. You are here because you have been given a vote of trust by your membership back home. In short, you have influence. That influence may well be our salvation. Obviously there is no one else who is doing anything tangible about the problems under discussion. Business does not seem to want to take a position. It is bad for business. Why risk offending a customer? Politicians do not want to do anything right now, there is an election in November. Why offend a voter? The average man does not want to get involved. He might lose his job.

No one wants to offend the radicals, the hoodlums, the rioters, the dope peddlers, and all the other special interests, including organized crime. Everybody is so afraid of losing business, or votes or getting involved that those who would make us rotten have been able to stir up the biggest stink since the fall of the Roman Empire.

We read about the big Women's Liberation fight. Frankly I regard the movement as ridiculous. In fact, I feel like apologizing for being a woman. Today on TV they were marching in N.Y. and one woman was stark naked.

Even a decent liberation movement would seem silly. If women want any change of any kind they can get it very easily. They do not need to band together for a lot of foolish demands on men. All they need do is band together and put the right men in office. Men who will tell them the truth, protect their rights and vote the way they are told to vote. In short represent the people for a change.

And, if I seemed harsh on women earlier because they have not lived up to their promise 50 years ago, it is only because I believe that we have the most to lose and the most to gain by putting the responsibility of our vote ahead of every other interest outside of home and family, and here I believe the vote is the protector of the home.

I do not have a crystal ball, and I lay no claims to any unusual psychic powers. But, I do think you will admit that most women have pretty good intuition. That we can sense the urgency of a situation when it is really important. It was that kind of urgency which I felt when I received your invitation to speak here this morning. I felt I had to make this trip. I felt it and just seemed to know that if I could find the right words, if I could say the right things that perhaps I could convince you that you, the General Federation of Women's Clubs of America, are the only group in America who can save it. You can, right here in San Antonio this very week, call a special meeting or whatever your bylaws permit in case of extreme emergencies and you can start the wheels turning.

I have never before advocated or thought it a very good idea for women to organize against men. I have always been the first one to say "brains have no sex."

I have always regarded women, like men as people, and felt that it was silly to think in terms of pitting one against the other. I am proud to be married and the mother of two teenage daughters, who are not marching, or smoking pot. I am proud to be a woman and it has not interfered with a constructive and successful career.

But the time has come when I have come to one definite conclusion and I ask you to bear with me.

We remember the story of the women in Brazil in the early sixties when that country was on the verge of enemy takeover. At the 11th hour the women banded to-

gether and almost single handedly saved their country.

I think we have reached the 11th hour. I think it is time for women to mobilize and to band together, get on the telephone, ring door bells, appoint group captains in every section of every town and city, and to set up some new rules and list the things you want done and decide who can do it best in the field of politics and throw out the ones who can't and put in the ones who are willing to stand up and be counted and to do our bidding. This mobilized group of millions of women would also turn off the TV sets, initiate concerted drives against those things which are infecting our nation and in short—clean house. Once this is done we can then walk down the streets in safety, enjoy the parks, send our children off to school without fear and go back to enjoying being women.

Your Federation has made great strides in dealing with the problem of moral pollution. You have the guidelines set up. With the strength of your organization, and with the prospect of forming an alliance with every other women's organization in the United States, we could have a potential of over 45 million women working day and night to put the United States back on its feet.

I would like to think of such an effort as a "Crusade for Morality." Certainly your President, Mrs. Magee, has worked diligently to lay the groundwork.

It is possible to restore our country's greatness. It is possible to keep "In God We Trust" on our money. It is possible to keep our flag waving and to let our children pray. But only the organized efforts of millions of women are going to be able to do it. Women must "take a stand." The men can't and they won't. Those who want to and are in the minority should be invited to help us.

We can change things. It can only be done if you are willing to consider this an emergency. To be willing to raise your voices in unison so that our government hears it loud and clear. We need action. And we will get it if we band together and make those in power understand we will no longer tolerate do-nothingness about crime, corruption, narcotics, enemy inspired riots, and campus demonstrations. We want to eliminate moral pollution from the face of the United States of America. How many of you feel that something has to be done? How many feel that the time is now? That we cannot wait?

Are you willing to consider my plan? If you are, I am willing to put myself at your disposal whenever and wherever needed. I will use all the talent, expertise and energy I have to help you bring together every other women's group in the U.S. and later the world to accomplish our goals.

FREEDOM OF INQUIRY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) has been denied the use of Oceanside High School's facilities for one of his congressional forums.

As one of those who has had the privilege of appearing in New York's Fifth District at a forum sponsored by Mr. LOWENSTEIN to discuss the volunteer army at Baldwin High School, I rise to

simply state my disbelief at the events which have taken place at Oceanside High School. It is inconceivable to me that a Member of Congress would be classified as causing controversy, thus depriving him of public facilities and creating a confrontation with students and administrators.

I was pleased to have an opportunity to publicly discuss the difficult problems of a volunteer military at Mr. LOWENSTEIN's request and regret that Oceanside High School has taken the action they have.

Public discussion of issues is the essence of informed citizens in this Republic and should not be diminished or denied.

PUBLIC HAS NO OBLIGATION TO SUBSIDIZE PENN CENTRAL

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD herewith an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean concerning the scheme to use the taxpayers' money to subsidize the Penn Central Railroad.

The editorial follows:

PUBLIC HAS NO OBLIGATION TO SUBSIDIZE PENN CENTRAL

The Nixon administration is planning to dump hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' dollars into an attempt to save the Penn Central railroad from bankruptcy.

Initially, the plan calls for the Defense Department to guarantee bank loans of up to \$200 million for Penn Central. But in addition to this, the administration intends to ask Congress to authorize the Transportation Department to provide \$750 million to Penn Central and some other financially troubled railroads.

The administration apparently does not need congressional authorization for the Defense Department to guarantee the \$200 million loans. Thus there may be no way to prevent this almost certain give-away of taxpayers' money to prop up a railroad that is losing money steadily and heavily.

However, Congress can—and should—reject the effort to appropriate more tax money to throw away on a losing proposition. There is no reason why the taxpayers should have to put out one dime to subsidize a giant private corporation that is no longer making a big profit in open competition.

The Penn Central has run into hard times because of a number of factors—including horrible service to the public and constant bickering between top level executives of the two railroads, New York Central and Pennsylvania, which merged to form the Penn Central two years ago.

The railroad's service is so bad and indifferent that numerous big shippers have given up in disgust and turned to other forms of transportation.

For example, the traffic director of a large brewery in Cleveland said Penn Central's service today is the poorest he has seen in 35 years in the traffic management business, according to the Wall Street Journal. The traffic manager of B. F. Goodrich Co. said "if I can avoid using Penn Central under any circumstances, I am going to do it." The Pennsylvania public utility commissioner

charged Penn Central with "a pattern of neglect bordering on contempt for the public."

These recommendations don't make the railroad appear as a sound investment for the taxpayers' dollars. The public money which the administration proposes to advance is represented as a loan. But only a dreamer would believe that this money could put Penn Central in the black and enable it to repay the loans. Any money put into the railroad would be simply a subsidy from the taxpayers to an unprofitable private industry.

Some members of the administration are puzzled over President Nixon's approval of this giveaway. One official expressed surprise that a Republican administration would bring government this close to "socialism" through subsidy arrangements aimed at bailing out specific companies in trouble.

The answer requires an understanding of the political history of the Pennsylvania railroad, the dominant partner in the merger. The Pennsylvania has long been called "a Republican railroad" because its executives usually have been supporters of and heavy contributors to the Republican cause.

It seems likely the Republicans could swallow quite a bit of socialism in order to save this old friend and paragon of self-reliance and free enterprise efficiency. However, it is inconsiderate of the GOP to ask the public to pay off its own political debts and bail out a railroad that still displays a "public-be-damned" attitude.

SECRETARY HICKEL'S VISIT TO HELLS CANYON

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beautiful sections of the Second District of Oregon, and indeed, the Nation, is Wallowa County. This magnificent county, justifiably called the "American Alps," borders the breathtaking Hells Canyon of the great Snake River. This untamed stretch of the Snake River is the subject of controversy in my State because of conflicting plans for its future. On the one hand, a combine of public and private utility companies are proposing, pending a decision by the Federal Power Commission, to construct a new dam in this area. Many of the residents of Wallowa County support this proposal in the belief that the dam will generate sorely needed economic development. On the other hand, many Oregonians are seriously concerned that a new dam would detract from the natural beauty of the Hells Canyon and have a negative effect on the ecology of the river.

Recently, the Secretary of the Interior, Walter Hickel, visited the Hells Canyon to see the situation for himself. The visit of the Secretary, and the illustrious members of his party, Burl Ives and Arthur Godfrey, was most welcome. The trip should have provided an excellent opportunity for Secretary Hickel to hear both sides of the issue first-hand from those most concerned with the area's future. Unfortunately, this was not the

happy result. I have received several letters from residents of Wallowa County, expressing dismay that despite their attempts to meet with the Secretary, they were turned away. I insert excerpts from these letters in the RECORD.

I greatly appreciate Secretary Hickel's interest in the future of Hells Canyon. I hope, however, that he will not consider that his trip was completely successful. Looking at the area of controversy is only one aspect of the investigation; listening to those most familiar with the country is certainly also a necessary part of the job.

The letters follow:

UNION, OREG., June 1, 1970.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: While visiting in Wallowa County recently I was shocked to learn of the strange treatment given a group of the county's residents by Secretary of Interior Walter Hickel.

Upon learning of Secretary Hickel's schedule an attempt was made by the local people for an audience with him and his accompanying celebrities. This request was denied because Mr. Hickel did not want any power groups present. After it had been adequately explained this was not a power group they were noticed an audience because three weeks' notice would be necessary for a security clearance. (It is very interesting to note the Hickel-Godfrey-Ives group visited with a group of Washington State University students who were conducting an environmental camp-in. I wonder if such a security check was made on this group.)

It is most disturbing that Secretary Hickel turned a deaf ear to local residents whose present and future depends so much on the decisions made by government officials. Certainly it is a sad situation when the Secretary of Interior completely ignores the judgment of the local residents before making his ill-advised decisions. In my opinion it was very thoughtless of him to completely deny them an audience.

One cannot help but compare this conduct with your kindness and consideration as demonstrated to the residents of this same area during your visit about two weeks ago.

I have visited with some of the local people regarding this situation and find they prefer the judgment of the residents of the area and their elected representative in Congress to the opinions of the Secretary's self-appointed "experts".

If my memory serves me correctly, only a few weeks ago Secretary Hickel was urging the President to listen to the voices of the disturbed college students. I am quite perplexed because it seems he did not show the same concern for the rights of Wallowa County people to be heard. Perhaps if we could visit with Secretary Hickel himself we might better understand his views.

Of course there is always the chance someone on the staff may have been overly protective and believed he was shielding Secretary Hickel from too many citizens demanding his attention.

This country was founded and has progressed through the years under the supposition that government is by the people and for the people. If our President believes this to be true he can do no less than advise Secretary Hickel of the obligations of his office to the people he is supposed to serve, and instruct the Secretary to meet with a Wallowa County delegation and listen to the views of the people most concerned.

Sincere wishes and best regards,

WILLIAM (BILL) COOPER.

WALLOWA COUNTY BOARD OF REALTORS,

May 27, 1970.

Representative AL ULLMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: As we talked this morning you are aware that we have only 6330 people in Wallowa County and that our income is the lowest per capita of any County in Oregon and that we neither have numbers or wealth to stop the rich from making a discriminatory playground out of around a third of our County and keeping any more Hydro electric Dam projects from being built on the Snake River. If we had the Mountain Sheep or Appalouosa Dam built we would have enough power to ensure a continuing supply to an Industrialist that we have who has expressed interest in bringing in one or two payrolls in this County. You know we have lost all of our Sawmills except one and may loose it.

Friday afternoon and evening Mr. Walter Hickel, Secretary of the Interior, Arthur Godfrey, and Burl Ives were at the Lewis Clark Hotel in Lewiston, Idaho prior to going up the Snake River by boat. Several People asked that the Wallowa County Board of Realtors ask if they might bring a cross representative group of six people to Lewiston and talk with these gentlemen and bring them views of the people most effected by the proposed H.R. 15444. Sen. Packwood proposed Hells Canyon-Snake National River Bill, the 8 year no Hydro Development Moratorium on the Snake River, and your H.R. 16437 Hells Canyon Recreational Area Bill.

We were told no we could not come to talk with these gentlemen or attend the Social Hour or the Banquet. Mr. Floyd Harvey the man in charge who has chartered trips up the Snake said if the applications were in three weeks ago we may have been allowed to attend. (Three weeks ago no one here was aware of any forthcoming meeting of this type) He said "Wallowa County was represented, the Governor had been invited and some residents", when I asked him who he did not know who they were. No one seems to know anyone from Wallowa County that had an invitation.

Our Wallowa County Board of Realtors composed of members in Real Estate and Affiliate Members from many interests and Civic groups including County Court voted against the two Park Bills and the Moratorium on the Snake as they feel any one of the three would be detrimental to the economy of Wallowa County.

Since there are to few of us to march on anything or demand Godfrey or Ives homes be turned into exclusive playgrounds we asked all Citizens to help us defeat the 8 year Moratorium Bill on the Snake and the Park Bills.

Sincerely yours,

PEARL H. INGLE,
Secretary Treasurer.

ARE TEAR GAS AND HERBICIDES PERMITTED WEAPONS?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my esteemed colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) and I discussed in separate statements the failure of the administration to place before the Senate as pledged the question of ratifying the 1925 Geneva protocol. The protocol prohibits the use in war of asphyxiating,

poisonous or other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare.

This delay in submitting the protocol to the Senate for advice and consent appears due, in part, to the administration's interpretation of the protocol. To hold that the protocol does not prohibit the use of tear gas and herbicides in war is controversial and a view held by a small minority of the signatories to the treaty. This is pointed out in the following comment by Jozef Goldblat which appeared in the April 1970 bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Mr. Goldblat is presently a member of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute in Stockholm.

The article follows:

ARE TEARGAS AND HERBICIDES PERMITTED WEAPONS?

(By Jozef Goldblat)

The present official position of the United States with regard to irritants such as tear (lachrymatory) gas, and chemicals affecting plants such as herbicides is, by and large, as follows:

1. The prohibition under the 1925 Geneva Protocol does not cover the use of tear gas in war.

2. The United States has been consistently opposed to such prohibition ever since the question arose.

3. Herbicides are not covered by the Geneva Protocol. The use of chemicals affecting plants is not prohibited. It was never seriously and conclusively discussed in international forums.

My purpose here is to examine whether these assertions are correct.

In 1924, a special Sub-Committee of the League of Nations Temporary Mixed Commission was set up to study the effects which would be produced by the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons and to give the public an accurate conception of the dangers which it had to fear.

The Sub-Committee consulted qualified experts—chemists, physiologists and bacteriologists from various countries including France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Denmark and the United States—and received authoritative opinions. These were included in the report of the Temporary Mixed Commission of July 30, 1924, which stated that the agents used in chemical warfare could be classified according to their effect on the human body as (1) irritant (lachrymatory, sneeze-producing and blistering) agents, (2) suffocating or asphyxiating agents and (3) toxic agents.

The report was brought to the attention of governments by the Council of the League of Nations. It served as a basis for discussion at the Conference for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War, convened at Geneva on May 4, 1925. No objection was voiced at that time to prohibiting chemical warfare in the sense given it by the Temporary Mixed Commission, and as classified by that Commission.

On June 17, 1925, the Conference adopted the Protocol prohibiting the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare. Since asphyxiating and poisonous gases were specifically mentioned, the word "other" could refer only to the third remaining category of chemical agents, namely irritant agents.

The first public controversy about tear gas started on December 2, 1930, at the twentieth meeting of the Sixth Session (Second Part) of the League of Nations Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, with the presentation of a memorandum by the British Delegation. Referring to the English text of the Geneva Protocol of 1925, it said: "Basing itself on this English

text, the British Government have taken the view that the use of 'other' gases, including lachrymatory gases was prohibited."

The French stand, made known on the same day, was even more categorical. In a special note the French Delegation stated:

"I. All the texts at present in force or proposed in regard to the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or similar gases are identical. In the French delegation's opinion, they apply to all gases employed with a view to toxic action on the human organism, whether the effects of such action are a more or less temporary irritation of certain mucous membranes or whether they cause serious or even fatal lesions.

"II. The French military regulations, which refer to the undertaking not to use gas for warfare (gaz de combat) subject to reciprocity, classify such gases as suffocating, blistering, irritant and poisonous gases in general, and define irritant gases as those causing tears, sneezing, etc.

"III. The French Government therefore considers that the use of lachrymatory gases is covered by the prohibition arising out of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 or Chapter IV of the draft Convention.

"The fact that, for the maintenance of internal order, the police, when dealing with offenders against the law, sometimes use various appliances, discharging irritant gases cannot, in the French delegation's opinion, be adduced in a discussion on this point, since the Protocol or Convention in question relates only to the use of poisonous or similar gases in war."

The fact that the ban on the use of tear gases had been included in the French military regulations shows that the French government never entertained any doubt as to the applicability to such gases of the Geneva Protocol, which it was the first to ratify.

DIFFERENT VERSIONS

The dispute was ostensibly provoked by a discrepancy between the French and English versions of the text of the Protocol. The French word "similaires" (with reference to gases) appeared in the English text as "other." Thus the French version would have seemed more restrictive than the English. However, the French understanding of the word "similaires"—and it is this interpretation which must be considered authentic and therefore authoritative—is in fact all-embracing. In this particular case, "similaires" has the same meaning as "other."

Neither was there any doubt in the mind of other speakers at the same meeting of the Commission as to the correctness of the interpretation given in the British memorandum, namely that the use of tear gases was prohibited by the Protocol of 1925. The only exception was the U.S. Representative, Hugh Gibson, who said that there would be considerable hesitation on the part of many governments to bind themselves to refrain from the use in war, against an enemy, of agencies which they have adopted for peacetime use against their own population. And this in spite of the fact that the English version, accepted by the U.S. delegation in 1925 and containing the term "other," did not lend itself to ambiguity. If at the time of signing the Geneva Protocol the United States had wished to restrict the prohibition to lethal gases, it would have asked to employ an appropriate term in the text.

In any event, this was, to my knowledge, the only official U.S. statement, made before an international audience, admitting the possibility of use of tear gas in war, until American troops got involved in the Vietnam hostilities. A mere conjecture made in 1930, which the United States itself had subsequently discarded, took the shape of an ad hoc argument 36 years later when the U.S. representative at the twenty-first U.N. General Assembly spoke about the actual use of tear gas in Vietnam.

TEAR GAS BANNED

The record shows that after December 1930 a number of conclusions reached and resolutions adopted by the League of Nations bodies confirmed that tear gas was included in the category of banned weapons. The United States was no longer opposed to such an interpretation of the prohibition of chemical warfare and repeatedly stated that it was against the use of tear gas in war.

Further debate was concerned neither with the interpretation of the Protocol, which was clear to all, nor with altering its meaning, but rather with the strengthening of its provisions by extending the ban to cover the very possession of chemical weapons.

Divergencies arose only with regard to the question of whether the manufacture, import and export of substances suitable both for peaceful and warlike purposes, including tear gas, should and could be forbidden, or at least restricted within the framework of the then contemplated prohibition of preparations for chemical warfare. No one denied the right to use tear gas in time of peace for police operations.

The Special Committee of the Disarmament Conference in its Report of May 31, 1932, included in the definition of chemical weapons all substances having a harmful effect. No account was taken of the degree of harmfulness of these substances. The Committee accepted the U.S. view that the use of lachrymatory gases for police purposes could not be open to any objection, but was of the opinion that lachrymatory gases should not be considered separately from the point of view of their use in warfare.

Resolution I submitted by the Committee to the General Commission of the Disarmament Conference contained the declaration that "there should be included in qualitative disarmament the use, for the purpose of injuring an adversary, of all natural or synthetic noxious substances, whatever their state, whether solid, liquid or gaseous, whether toxic, asphyxiating, lachrymatory, irritant, vesicant, or capable in any way of producing harmful effects on the human or animal organism, whatever the method of their use." (Qualitative disarmament meant absolute prohibition of certain categories of weapons.)

On June 27, 1932, in the General Commission, the American representative read out a statement of the instructions issued by President Hoover to the U.S. Delegation to the Disarmament Conference. The program of disarmament presented to the Conference included a proposal for the abolition of all chemical warfare.

On November 8, 1932, in the course of the discussion on the report, submitted earlier by the Chairman of the Special Committee in the Bureau of the Conference, U.S. Representative Wilson said: "There was no question of its [tear gas] use in time of war, but the U.S. Delegation would have difficulty in undertaking to give up the preparation and employment of this gas for local police purposes." He also suggested the inclusion in the report of a provision authorizing the training of the police in the use of gas for local police purposes. (It was taken for granted that the training of armed forces in the use of tear gas should be forbidden.)

In the course of the discussion in the Special Committee on Chemical, Bacterial and Incendiary Weapons, meeting in November and December of 1932, the U.S. representative said that the American government was willing to forego the use of lachrymatory substances for military purposes in war time. While therefore in favor of prohibition in this sense, the U.S. representative urged that the use of lachrymatory gases for police purposes and for protecting private property should be permitted. He felt that special regulations could be introduced which would prevent abuse.

The French delegate then drew attention to the difficulty of regulating the use of

lachrymatory substances. Thus, for instance, a lachrymatory substance used even before World War I by the French police in arresting dangerous criminals, was used for charging asphyxiating shells during the war. He stressed that in strong doses or when used under certain conditions, all lachrymatory gases could be poisonous, and some were even poisonous in small doses.

The Committee suggested that, in order to avoid abuse, a State wishing to use lachrymatory substances should be compelled to inform the Permanent Disarmament Commission. It should state the substances used, the implements which it proposed to employ and their number. The Commission would examine the question whether there was any disproportion between the arms notified and police requirements.

The U.S. Delegation did not object to the above suggestion. At the January 1933 meeting of the Bureau of the Conference, it questioned the requirement of submitting a list of lachrymatory substances and appliances, as imposing an extremely arduous task, but it was not opposed to the principle of restrictions.

U.K. CONVENTION

The United Kingdom Draft Convention, submitted to the General Commission of the Disarmament Conference on March 16, 1933, contained the following provision: "The prohibition of the use of chemical weapons shall apply to the use, by any method whatsoever, for the purpose of injuring an adversary, of any natural or synthetic substance harmful to the human or animal organism, whether solid, liquid or gaseous, such as toxic, asphyxiating, lachrymatory, irritant or vesicant substances."

It also stated: "The High Contracting Parties shall inform the Permanent Disarmament Commission of the lachrymatory substances intended to be used by their authorities for police operations as well as of the number of the various appliances by means of which they are to be utilized."

No opposition was voiced by the U.S. Delegation to the first provision. With regard to the second, the United States proposed the following amendment: "The High Contracting Parties undertake to inform the Permanent Disarmament Commission annually of the lachrymatory substances used by their Governmental agencies or instrumentalities for police operations, as well as of the number and character of the various appliances by which the said lachrymatory substances are utilized."

The proposed change again confirmed the readiness of the U.S. government to accept restrictions on the use of tear gas even for internal police operations.

Thus there is strong evidence that whatever changes it might have still undergone, the Draft Convention, when adopted, would have included clauses explicitly prohibiting the use of lachrymatory gas in war.

PLANTS AND ANIMALS

The above may apply to the use of chemicals harmful to plants.

In its Report of May 31, 1932, the Special Committee of the Disarmament Conference stated that the prohibition should extend not merely to substances harmful to human beings, but to those harmful to animals. The Committee explained that no special reference was made to vegetables because it was felt that in practice it would not be possible to employ, for the purpose of damaging vegetables, substances which were not also harmful to human beings or animals, or which were not likely to make the vegetables harmful to them.

The statement based on the level of science of the early thirties can hardly be interpreted as permitting the use of substances harmful only to plants. Any doubt on the subject will be dispelled on reading Resolution II adopted by the said Committee with

regard to bacteriological weapons. The Committee declared:

That all methods for the projection, discharge, or dissemination in any manner, in places inhabited or not, of pathogenic microbes in whatever phase they may be (virulent or capable of becoming so), or of filter-passing viruses, or of infected substances, whether for the purpose of bringing them into contact with human beings, animals or plants, or for the purpose of affecting any of the latter in any indirect manner—for example, by polluting the atmosphere, water, foodstuffs, or any other objects—should be included in qualitative disarmament.

The resolution was adopted unanimously; the United States was a member. It would follow by straight analogy that the use of chemicals to destroy plants of the adversary was never considered permissible.

The aim of all the discussions on chemical and bacteriological weapons was to prevent the use of weapons directed solely against living organisms. Certain recently developed chemicals capable of damaging plants, even though harmless to people or animals, were unknown when the question was before the League of Nations. But it can be assumed that if they had existed, they would have been explicitly banned. What mattered was the target—men, animals, plants—irrespective of whether the means used were chemical or bacteriological.

More recent history has confirmed this approach. Protocol No. III, modifying and completing the Brussels Treaty of 1948, which was signed by the Members of the Western European Union in October 1954, defined chemical weapons as "any equipment or apparatus expressly designed to use, for military purposes, the asphyxiating, toxic, irritant, paralyzing, growth-regulating, anti-lubricating or catalysing properties of any chemical substance." The term "irritant" has all along been understood to include tear gas. The term "growth-regulating" can apply only to plants.

The preceding analysis seems to provide sufficient evidence that the ban on the use of irritants such as tear gas and chemicals affecting plants such as herbicides constitutes part and parcel of the rule of international law prohibiting chemical warfare.

The opinion prevailing in the United Nations was best expressed by the U.N. Secretary-General. In his foreword to the report on chemical and bacteriological weapons and the effects of their possible use, issued in 1969, he urged the members of the United Nations "to make a clear affirmation that the prohibition contained in the Geneva Protocol applies to the use in war of all chemical, bacteriological and biological agents (including tear gas and other harassing agents), which now exist or may be developed in the future."

NO BETTER WAY TO GET FACTS THAN BY PERSONAL VISIT

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no better way to have an understanding of problems in the field than to go to the scene and see for yourself, talk with the people, talk with local experts, and obtain a true feeling of the atmosphere.

Millard C. Browne, editor of the editorial page for the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, has just returned from a tour of the Far East, in which he visited several key countries.

Mr. Browne is a distinguished editor and columnist who has won many awards for his perceptive writing on matters of local, national, and international concern.

His trip to the Far East has given him an insight into the difficult international problems of that area with which our country has become so intimately concerned.

No matter how many books you read, no matter how many periodicals you study, no matter how many television reports you watch, it is only by on-the-spot study and reporting that you can obtain the real feel of the conditions and understand the complexities of the geography, of the economics, of the politics, and of the national spirit of a community, a state, or country.

VALUE OF PERSONAL VISIT

Mr. Browne has set a fine example for his profession by taking the time to make this personal visit to the Far East. There can be no question of the value this information will be to himself and his readers.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Browne already has a national reputation in the field of journalism, having been a repeated recipient of honors from the Freedom Foundation. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1942, and has been a member of the Pulitzer Prize jury for newspaper competition.

He is a former president of the National Conference of Editorial Writers, and as a longtime member of Sigma Delta Chi, he helped to found the Buffalo area chapter in 1966 and was its first president.

He is a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and is chairman of the Right-to-Know Committee of the New York Society of Newspaper Editors.

He has been with the Buffalo Evening News since 1944, became its chief editorial writer in 1953, and recently was elevated to the position of editor of the editorial page. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Browne has begun a perceptive series of articles on his trip, and as a part of my remarks, I include the first two in the series:

WEALTHY HONG KONG IS DAZZLING BUT JITTERY IN EAST-WEST MARRIAGE

(By Millard C. Browne)

(NOTE.—The News editorial page editor has just returned from the International Press Institute Assembly in Hong Kong and a post-assembly IPI tour of Taiwan, Korea and Japan. Here is the first of his reports.)

HONG KONG.—A cartoon book that neatly captures the sights and sounds of this vast, bustling, spectacular shoppers' and shopkeepers' paradise of the Far East sums it up in one neat phrase:

"Hong Kong is a money-splendored thing."

It is that indeed. Despite inflation and an ever-rising flood of tourism, Hong Kong remains the world's most fabulous shopping mart. It has one of the world's most spectacular harbors, and it is still a most dazzling place for bug-eyed sightseeing.

But Hong Kong is also, at another level, a great marriage of convenience between the free world and Communist China. It is not only where East meets West culturally and commercially, but it is also a great two-way window for Red China to peer out at the

rest of us, and for the outside world to peek as best it can into mainland China.

"CHINA WATCHING"

Diplomatically and journalistically, this has long been the No. 1 listening post for information about Communist China, the No. 1 headquarters for the highly specialized profession known as "China watching."

What impresses even the casual tourist, however, is how bold and blatant Red China's presence has become in this capitalist merchants' heaven. Right in the heart of Hong Kong, Communist Chinese run their own schools and propaganda movies. And in the midst of the Kowloon tourist center, between the swank Peninsula Hotel and its newer sister, the Hong Kong, one can spend a fascinated hour just wandering through a great shopping arcade called "China Arts and Crafts Ltd."

Here the smiling visage of Mao Tse-tung and his revolutionary exhortations, blazoned in red, stare at one from nearly every pillar. Here may be purchased—at prices competitive with any Hong Kong capitalist—every kind of Chinese artware from antique to modern.

NEW-STYLE GOODS

A few years ago, Americans had to beware of such lures, for nothing could be brought through customs without a certificate proving origin elsewhere than mainland China. But the Nixon administration has now somewhat eased this edict, so shoppers may buy at least the trinkets that catch their eye.

What they will quickly notice in this Peking showplace, however, is that most of the goods have been restyled in the revolutionary manner. In place of familiar lotus blossom figurines or jade Buddhas, one will find jade-carved Chinese peasants striking heroic poses, or a beautifully carved and inlaid lacquer chest with a worker astride a tractor, telling no doubt the story of Mao's revolution.

And in the book department, one will find 36 (count 'em) neat stacks of "Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung," each published in a different language—from Swahili and Senegalese to Thai and Nepalese.

FABULOUS VIEW

For all its accent on the dollar (\$1 U.S. equals \$6 HK), Hong Kong is, to any tourist, a many-splendored thing with or without money. The view, from almost anywhere, is fabulous—whether circling in for a landing, or seeing Hong Kong (Victoria) Island silhouetted across the harbor from Kowloon, or seeing the Kowloon side from Hong Kong.

The picturesque harbor itself is one of the endlessly fascinating sights, with its junks and sampans, ferries and freighters, tugboats and passenger liners all criss-crossing every which way in an ever-shifting kaleidoscope—marred only by drifts of smog created by the newly-motorized junks.

TEEMING STREETS

Seen casually from the harbor, both Kowloon and Hong Kong look like very modern, western metropolises, except for neon-blazoned Chinese characters on many of the towering office buildings. But traveling through the streets, one quickly discovers that, for all of its very British facade, Hong Kong is at heart a swarming mass of Chinese humanity.

A Sunday stroll from the top of famous Cat Street down Ladder Street through alleyways bustling with literally thousands of Chinese shops is enough to make one wonder if this can be the same world one saw from the harbor. Only after a thorough saturation in the sights and smells, the clatter and clutter of these unbelievably crowded native streets do the population statistics begin to make sense.

They describe today's Hong Kong as a community of more than 4 million people, seven times as many as lived there in 1945. Only about 40,000 are British; some 98½ per cent are Chinese. That is for the entire Crown Colony which embraces 236 islands and a part of the mainland known as the New Territories.

Hong Kong depends for its very existence, of course, on water and food lifelines leading into Red China. Britain's 99-year lease with China for the New Territories, moreover, will expire in another 27 years. So all that has been invested there, including new housing for hundreds of thousands of refugees from the mainland, could theoretically revert to Peking control in another generation.

BUBBLE COULD BURST

But none of Hong Kong's busy merchants, bankers or tallors seems to be losing much sleep over that prospect. For if Hong Kong were not a "marriage of convenience"—one which suits Red China as much as it does the Western-oriented tourist and trading interests—the whole bubble could burst overnight, and everyone here knows it.

The fact is that Communist China draws many advantages from letting Hong Kong thrive as it is—including about half of its total dollar exchange. So Hong Kong continues one of the great free cities of the world.

And if the bargains aren't nearly as good as they were a few years ago—which they assuredly are not—don't blame it on the Communists. For they're competing here too, doing their bit to drive prices down. Blame it rather on your millions of fellow tourists, who have shopped so greedily that it will now cost you about two-thirds as much to have a good suit made here as it would cost to buy it off the rack at a first-class store in Buffalo.

CHIANG RETAINS DREAM, BUT SOFTENS RHETORIC IN MORE RELAXED TAIWAN

(By Millard C. Browne)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—This beautiful island which the first Portuguese explorers called Formosa but the Chinese call Taiwan, looks so peaceful and prosperous, and its people generally seem so happy, that it is easy to forget its special significance as the refugee capital of an aging Free China Army and government which has now lived more than 20 years in exile.

Most of Taiwan's 14 million people, in fact, weren't even born when Chiang Kai-shek brought the tattered and beaten remnants of his mainland army here to rebuild for another round in the Chinese civil war he has never for a moment admitted losing.

He has kept his dream of eventual reconquest of the mainland alive ever since 1949. But now, with Chiang himself nearing the middle 80s and his old soldiers long since turned into road-builders, craftsmen and bureaucrats, it's a much mellow dream than it was even a dozen years ago.

COULD BE MISLEADING

To a hasty visitor whose impressions of change are based on only one quick previous visit in 1958, a sense of contrast can easily be misleading. But both the people we've seen in Taiwan and the rhetoric of the officials seem made more relaxed now than then.

Gone are the fierce threats of imminent attack on the mainland and the bristling aura of military preparedness. In their place is a distinctly civilian air of thriving prosperity—but with a seeming undercurrent of uneasiness as if the present condition is a little too good to remain true.

For our touring International Press Institute group of editors and publishers from 40 free world countries Chiang Kai-shek himself struck the keynote at an hour-long tea reception. Standing erect and sprightly,

the bald generalissimo challenged the world press to compare every aspect of life in the "model province of Taiwan" with conditions on the mainland.

OFFERS COMPARISON

"We know," he said, "the people on the mainland are fully convinced the day is coming when we shall return. All we have done here in 20 years is in preparation. We have built Taiwan as a model province for the new China, attuned to the three principles of peoples—nationalism, democracy and livelihood."

He invited comparison with Mao's regime on each count, noting repeatedly the "sharp contrast" between conditions on Taiwan and the way Mao had destroyed Chinese national customs and traditions in favor of internationalism; how Mao had used his so-called "new democracy" to deprive the people of all liberty in order to manipulate them for the regime's power, and how he had undermined the people's livelihood by depriving them of all personal freedom of action and movement.

Chiang posed the issue as "tyrannical government vs. a government of benevolence" and concluded: "Only a government of benevolence will reach the hearts of men." His hope of free China eventually returning to the mainland, he emphasized—in "sharp contrast" with the language his regime was using 12 years ago—rests "not primarily on military force but on political force as well as our national culture and spirit."

WORRISOME WEDGE

While a part of the IPI group spent one day inspecting the small heavily-armed and often-shelled island of Quemoy, just off the China coast, the rest were flown to see the magnificent new highway cut into the sides of the solid marble cliffs of Taroko Gorge near the east-coast village of Hualion.

The highway, an engineering marvel, had been built in three years by retired soldiers—that is, by the veterans of Chiang's famous "aging army." The ex-soldiers from the mainland have been put to work on many such special civilian-type enterprises. One we visited is a large marble quarry and plant where several hundred veterans turn out polished marble craft items.

Underlying the emphasis on veterans re-employment is some obvious anxiety about the wedge which mainland Communist propaganda keeps trying to drive between the native Taiwanese and the mainland Chinese refugees who still seem to hold most top jobs in the Free China government.

CHIANG DEFENSIVE?

Chiang himself referred somewhat defensively to the problem, terming the "so-called Formosa Independence movement" as "one of the most ulterior" of Communist propaganda efforts. The Chinese on Taiwan, he insisted, "are all one people—just ask any villager or shopkeeper."

While that was a fairly safe challenge, since we were all leaving the next morning and most of our English-speaking guides were mainlanders anyway, some "Old China hands" traveling with us thought that on this point Chiang was protesting a bit too much. They had no doubt that tensions between Taiwanese and mainland Chinese did exist, nor that most key figures in the national government were mainlanders.

As for the broader challenge to compare life under Chiang with life under Mao, our group of free-world journalists obviously had no credentials for attempting an objective evaluation, since Peking has issued no comparable visas or invitations.

MORE SECURE

All one can say, on the basis of a two-day guided glimpse of Taiwan, is that civilian life seems quite relaxed and prosperous. Also the old Chinese culture is very much in evidence, whether in neatly walled and gar-

dened city neighborhoods or in the self-contained and tidy villages we saw. It was almost impressively on display at the National Palace Museum, a magnificent and ultra-modern Taipei showplace.

While the military is still much in evidence, the signs of a police state are much less so than this writer remembered them in 1958. Chiang himself was conspicuously guarded, as was the long road to the beautiful Sun-Yat-sen memorial palace where we met him—but no more so than the Secret Service guard which typically surrounds our President.

All in all, this independent Chinese province of Taiwan seems both more secure than it once did, and less likely to try any foolish military escapades against the mainland. But what will happen after both Chiang and Mao depart is another question. They are the last of the World War II power figures still standing on the world stage. They can't have very long to go, and neither China, nationalist or Communist, will be the same without them.

HELP FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the discovery in April of extraordinary amounts of lethal chemical mercury in fish catches in Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie has further dramatized both the costliness and essential inequity of water pollution. The health hazard posed by the dumping of mercury-laden industrial wastes into lake waters led to banning of commercial fishing in these waters by Canadian, Michigan, and Ohio authorities, followed later by the granting of permission to fish under severely restricted conditions, including the confiscation of tens of thousands of pounds of contaminated fish.

The impact of these events on hundreds of hardy souls who engage in lake fishing for their livelihood has been nothing less than catastrophic and even more widespread injury to commercial fishermen—through no fault of their own—is likely because of the pollution of our waters which we have permitted and continue to permit. Even with vigorous pollution abatement programs and strict enforcement of water quality standards, we can expect more fishery failures in a number of domestic fishing areas for some time to come.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced a bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of restrictions imposed on domestic commercial fishing by a State or the Federal Government, because of deterioration in the quality of the aquatic environment.

Specifically, the bill would establish a grant program to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to help commercial fishermen meet the usual business expenses which, but for the economic loss caused by the imposition of restrictions, they ordinarily would be able to meet. The formula providing for payments not to exceed 70 percent of lost

earnings parallels that which Canadian fishermen have received from their government in the past and which is again available as a result of restrictions adversely affecting their fishing activities in the Great Lakes stemming from the recent mercury contamination.

In accepting a grant under the program, a commercial fisherman would assign to the Secretary all rights to recover damages against any party for committing or failing to commit acts which resulted in the imposition of restrictions. Any damages recovered by the Secretary in excess of the amount of the grant and the administrative expenses of recovery would be paid to the fishermen. This provision, it should be noted, would not only increase the likelihood of collection of damages from the polluter but would make the entire program largely self-liquidating.

The bill would authorize appropriations of \$4 million for fiscal year 1971 and of \$5 million for each of the 4 succeeding years.

Mr. Speaker, equity requires prompt passage of this measure. A variety of assistance programs are offered to almost every segment of our economic community to help alleviate distress from natural and other forms of disasters but, as Secretary Hickle advises, no Federal support is presently available to help commercial fishermen cope with the consequences of industrial and other forms of pollution that poison our waters, destroy the fish, and deprive self-respecting men of the opportunity to pursue their livelihood.

GAS SUPPLY WOULD RISE WITH PRICE HIKE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the House on May 27 relative to the serious shortage of natural gas.

This problem was called to my attention again this week when a major industry at Massillon was unable to obtain gas to supply a new plant addition. The industry must choose between expansion using another kind of fuel or moving to another location. What this means in terms of our economy should be obvious. It also has meaning in relation to the problem of pollution control. Industries that wish to do their part for the environment by changing to natural gas are not able to do so in Ohio.

The Oil and Gas Journal recently published an article which sheds some light on the situation, and I wish to include it with my remarks, as follows:

GAS SUPPLY WOULD RISE WITH PRICE HIKE

A sizable and immediate increase in well-head prices will halt the decline in U.S. reserves of natural gas.

Even so, half or more of the increased demand for gas between now and 1980 will have to be supplied by supplemental sources. And these will be much more expensive than present domestic pipeline gas—by 10 to 20¢/Mcf.

These were the main points in a "positive program" for balancing supplies with demand presented by a producer witness in the south-

ern Louisiana area-rate case before the Federal Power Commission.

Radford L. Shantz, vice-president of Foster Associates Inc., testified the reserves decline of the last 2 years could be halted. But to turn the trick, action must be taken quickly to boost rates, he warned. Increased incentives must be provided not only in southern Louisiana, he said, but throughout the U.S.

Shantz did not say how much incentive it will take to get the required drilling turnaround. But producers are known to be thinking of price increases amounting to several cents/Mcf. Specific figures will be introduced in current settlement efforts and in rate-design testimony later this year.

Big supplement needed. Shantz projected "an optimistic program" of supplemental gas supplies in the next decade, and even then said some potential consumer demand might be left unfilled.

By 1980, he estimated, the U.S. may be depending on supplements for as much as 6.6 trillion cu ft. This includes 1.6 trillion of Canadian gas (700 billion for the Great Lakes area, 900 billion for the West Coast), 2.3 trillion of foreign LNG (2 trillion on the East Coast, 300 billion on the West Coast), 300 billion cu ft of coal gas (all in the Great Lakes or midwest area), and 2.4 trillion of Alaskan gas (1.6 trillion in the Great Lakes, 800 billion on the West Coast).

The Alaskan volume might include some gas from Arctic Canada, and covers supplies shipped by tanker in the form of LNG as well as pipeline gas. In addition, the projection lists 200 billion in "other supplies" needed that year if demand forecast by the potential requirements committee is to be met. But Shantz doesn't claim to know where that is coming from.

Supplemental supplies will grow in three phases, according to his estimates. The first is from 1970 to 1972, when overland imports from western Canada will comprise the total supply supplement of base-load gas. This will rise from 800 billion—the current rate—to almost 1.1 trillion in 1972 with a further gradual rise to 1.6 trillion.

The second phase, 1973-76, will see imported LNG make a big impact, beginning at 100 billion in 1973 and rising to 1.3 trillion at the end of that period, then to 2.3 trillion 4 years later.

The third phase is 1976-80, with introduction of Alaskan and perhaps northern Canadian supplies. These are projected at 500 billion in 1976, with annual increases of 400 to 600 billion the next 4 years.

Supplements by 1980 then would account for 21.7% of total consumer demand of 30.4 trillion cu ft.

COST OF SUPPLEMENTS

Cost differentials between pipeline gas and other sources are controversial matters, and will be key issues in FPC's decision on new rates for wellhead domestic gas.

The Shantz estimates will probably add to the controversy, particularly where LNG is concerned, until an actual application before FPC sets forth firm prices.

Shantz declared foreign LNG to be "the best alternative and most viable supplemental supply of gas for the New York City market." He mentioned the El Paso Natural

Gas Co. proposal for delivery of Algerian LNG to Columbia Gas, Texas Eastern, and Tenneco.

El Paso has reported the rough delivered cost at shipside at around 50-55¢/Mcf. Other sources have mentioned vaporization costs of 5¢/Mcf. Shantz, however, said the more likely price of vaporized Algerian gas delivered at the city gate of New York to be 70-80¢.

This compares with average city gate price for domestic supplies of 40.7¢/Mcf on July 1, 1968, and 41.6¢/Mcf as of July 1, 1969, including rates in effect subject to refund.

So whether the actual LNG price turns out to be 60, 70 or 80¢, the premium over current pipeline gas will still be large. Producers will argue that this leaves plenty of room for boosting domestic wellhead prices in order to expand U.S. supply and still save consumers money over the cheapest alternative.

The best alternative for the Chicago market, according to Shantz, is Canadian gas, and here the prices are better known. If pending applications are approved by U.S. and Canadian authorities without change, Canadian gas could be delivered this winter at 43¢/Mcf—well above the 29.1¢ average for domestic gas in Chicago last July 1.

Domestic reserves expansion. The producer witness predicted that southern Louisiana will continue to lead the rest of the nation in additions to reserves—if incentives are provided.

If this is done, Shantz said, this region could continue to provide 40% of the reserves additions as it has over the past 10 years. This is a tall order, the supply specialist acknowledged, in view of the fact that only in one year have south Louisiana reserves additions exceeded 8.4 trillion. That was in 1962 when 9.2 trillion was added.

Gas production in south Louisiana, under the reserves projections, would increase from 6.789 trillion cu ft in 1969 to 8.3 trillion in 1975 and 9.8 trillion in 1980.

Shantz started with an assumed reserves addition nationally of 21 trillion cu ft this year—optimistic in view of the 12 trillion and 8 trillion increments in 1968 and 1969.

From this point, he said, it is possible that reserves additions might be increased by 5% /year given appropriate price levels.

On this basis, reserves additions would reach 26.8 trillion cu ft by 1975 and 34.2 trillion by 1980. Even at that pace, Shantz pointed out, total reserves for continental U.S. would not regain the high-water mark of 289 trillion, achieved the end of 1967, until the year 1978.

This schedule of reserves increases, according to his calculations, would support production increases from 20.6 trillion cu ft in 1969 to 22.3 trillion in 1971. But, if the reserves-to-production ratio is held at 12:1 from that point on, production increases will be only modest, with levels rising to 23.2 trillion in 1975 and 25.8 trillion in 1980.

This would leave some unfulfilled consumer demand, starting in 1972 at 100 billion cu ft, rising to a peak of 2.2 trillion in 1975, and declining to 200 billion cu ft by 1980 as supplements move in.

Boosting production further by letting the ratio fall below 12:1, in Shantz' view, would run risks of deliverability failures in some areas. In fact, he cautioned, the 12:1 figure does not provide a minimum cushion.

GAS SUPPLY AND DEMAND IN THE UNITED STATES¹

	Consumer demand	Domestic production, trillion cubic feet				Other supplies
		South Louisiana	Other United States	Supplemental supplies ²		
1959.....	10.7	2.0	8.6	0.1		
1969.....	19.5	6.4	12.4	.7		
1980.....	30.4	9.0	14.6	6.6	.2	
Increase:						
1959-69.....	8.8	4.4	3.8	.6		
1969-80.....	10.9	2.6	2.2	5.9	.2	

¹ Excludes field use.

² Includes Alaska.

Source: Radford C. Shantz, Foster Associates.

City-gate price of prospective supplemental gas¹

	¢/Mcf
Chicago market: ²	
Average city-gate price of domestic gas supplies, as of July 1, 1969	29.1
Prospective price of imported Canadian gas delivered at city gate at 100% load factor	43.0
New York market: Average city-gate price of domestic gas supplies:	
As of July 1, 1968	40.7
As of July 1, 1969	41.6
Estimated price of prospective imported LNG produced in Algeria	70.0-80.0

¹ Estimated price of gas supplies compared with current price of domestic gas deliveries.

² Estimated prices of prospective receipts of lignite-gas and Alaskan gas are not shown because of uncertainties of cost estimates.

³ The average price shown for New York City as of July 1, 1969 reflects rates in effect subject to refund in pending rate cases.

Source: Radford C. Shantz, Foster Associates.

THREE U.S. LINES WIN PERMIT TO IMPORT MORE CANADIAN GAS

The Federal Power Commission last week authorized three pipelines to import 248 MMcf of Canadian natural gas into the Upper Midwest at the original contract price.

The commission reversed the hearing examiner who had recommended that the initial purchase price be lowered from 32 to 30¢/Mcf. The unanimous commission opinion, written by Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., was the first major test of FPC's pricing policy toward Canadian gas in the current supply crisis and under present leadership.

FPC approved \$50.7 million in new transmission facilities for Michigan Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., Great Lakes Gas Transmission Co., and Midwestern Gas Transmission Co. The gas will be purchased from Trans-Canada Pipe Lines Ltd.

The opinion held that the record shows the originally proposed 32¢ initial purchase price is consistent with the public interest. FPC went along with the examiner in approving the price escalation provision in the contract calling for 1.25¢/Mcf each 5 years until the level reaches 37¢.

In a previous price confrontation on Canadian gas, FPC—under former chairman Lee C. White—precipitated a crisis by cutting contract prices to a level unacceptable to Canadian authorities. The case, involving Westcoast Transmission Co. sales to El Paso Natural Gas Co., was later resolved by compromise settlement.

The commission said its prompt action would help in alleviating "a foreseen 1970 fuel shortage" in the Chicago area.

FPC said that while the staff contended it should not in effect give advance approval of periodic price increases, the increases proposed are modest and reasonable.

The escalations, it added, will not wholly cover Trans-Canada's foreseen cost increases.

Michigan Wisconsin will spend \$33.8 million for pipeline facilities and import 50 MMcf to be delivered at Marshfield, Wis. FPC previously authorized \$37.3 million in facilities for the pipeline in Phase 1 of the proceeding.

Great Lakes will build \$10 million in facilities to import an added 190.8 MMcf for sale to Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America, Michigan Wisconsin, and Inter-City Gas Ltd. Midwestern will install 11,900 hp in compressors costing \$6.7 million to import 7.2 MMcf for increased supplies and additional fuel.

Two pipelines filing exceptions to the examiner's decision had sought delay in FPC action pending resolution of rate issues. But FPC agreed with the examiner that there would be immediate public benefits from the additional gas supply.

SUPPORT FOR PRETRIAL DETENTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to a story in today's Washington Star which confirms the necessity for the pretrial detention provision in the House version of the District of Columbia crime bill.

U.S. District Court Judge George L. Hart today testified before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee that the 1966 Bail Reform Act "has permitted rapes, armed robberies, and attempts at murder that otherwise could have been prevented."

The cases cited by Judge Hart demonstrate beyond question the need for the pretrial detention provision in the District of Columbia crime bill.

Existing law enables the violent criminal to walk the streets and terrorize innocent victims because the Bail Reform Act requires that a Federal judge consider only a suspect's likelihood of flight, not his dangerousness, in setting bail.

Judge Hart is not the first judicial official in the District of Columbia to uphold the urgent need for pretrial detention in violent cases. In December 1969, the Tydings advisory panel against armed violence, headed by Judge Alfred Burka of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, reached a similar conclusion. With one dissenting vote, the panel concluded that "pretrial detention offers an immediate response to armed violence and adds long-range rationality to our criminal justice system."

Other members of TYDINGS' panel included:

Frederick H. Evans, past president of the Washington Bar Association.

William T. Finley, Jr., former Assistant Deputy Attorney General of the United States.

Thomas A. Flannery, U.S. Attorney General for the District of Columbia.

Herbert J. Miller, Jr., chairman, 1966 President's Commission on Crime for the District of Columbia.

Paul Miller, dean, Howard University School of Law.

Luke Moore, former Chief Marshal for the District of Columbia.

H. Carl Moultrie, past president, NAACP, District of Columbia Chapter.

Tilmon O'Bryant, Deputy Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department.

William E. Rollow, secretary and general counsel, National Capital Area Council of Sportsmen, and president, District of Columbia Skeet Shooting Association.

James C. Slaughter, Director of the District of Columbia Human Relations Commission.

Quinn Tamm, executive director, International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Joseph P. Yeldell, member, District of Columbia City Council.

I commend the following section of

the report of the advisory panel against armed violence to the House membership:

PRETRIAL DETENTION AND SPEEDY PROSECUTION

Armed violence in the District of Columbia is being aided and abetted by the inadequate operation of our criminal justice system.

At present, justice is neither swift nor certain. Persons who are apprehended for crimes of violence remain at liberty for eight months to a year. Many of them commit additional offenses with virtual impunity knowing that they will again be released on bail after the second or third offense, that the offense committed on bail will not be reached for trial for a year or so; that the sentence, if any, will probably be concurrent; and that fugitivity in the District of Columbia is a fairly secure status which can postpone the day of reckoning for many more months.

The net effect of these circumstances is tragic. The public is victimized again and again—almost without resource. The work of the police is undercut and correctional efforts are severely impeded.

Action is imperative. In the view of this panel, we cannot await long-range remedies. We must take steps which will have immediate effect in abating armed violence.

For reasons developed more fully below, we urge:

Enactment of bail legislation to permit pretrial detention of certain defendants who pose a danger to the community.

Accelerating the disposition of cases of armed violence by expanding the individual calendar program, by prompt indictment, by decreasing time for mental exams and by speedier sentencing procedures.

Expedited appeal in cases of persons charged with more than one crime of violence.

Development of better procedures to supervise persons on bail and to secure the return of persons who become fugitive, and

Enactment of court reorganization legislation together with the proposed increases in judicial manpower and the creation of a court executive.

PRETRIAL DETENTION

There is no doubt that accused felons free on bail while awaiting trial commit a significant part of the serious crimes in this city. Judicial Council Committee studies indicate that one of every 11 defendants who is indicted and released on bail is reindicted for another felony while awaiting trial. The police report that one out of every three armed robbery suspects released on bail is arrested for another offense before he comes to trial.

Further, it appears that persons involved in certain types of crime have a much higher rate of recidivism. Specifically, the District of Columbia Crime Commission found that persons charged with robbery, burglary and narcotics offenses were more frequently indicted for additional crimes on bail than were persons charged with other offenses.

Most recently, Police Chief Jerry Wilson has highlighted the bail problem. He reported to the President that there are about 100 professional hold-up men in the District of Columbia who are repeatedly released on bail and commit additional hold-ups. In his view, legislation authorizing pretrial detention of such persons is *item number one* on any list of action to abate armed violence. In fact, he states that if 300 dangerous criminals were removed from the streets, we could "almost cure" the problem of armed violence in Washington.

However, under existing law, there is virtually no way to remove these dangerous persons from the street in any less than eight months or a year. First, the Bail Reform Act of 1966 requires the release on bail of all defendants not involved in capital crimes no matter how dangerous. The only factor

which the court may consider in setting bail is the likelihood that the defendant will flee. Second, the court system is so backlogged that crimes of violence cannot be prosecuted promptly. In fiscal 1968, it took an average of nine months for bank robbery cases to come to trial, an average of eight and one-half months for robbery cases to come to trial, an average of nine and one-half months for aggravated assault cases to come to trial, an average of ten months for second degree murder cases, and an average of fourteen months for first degree murder cases.

In view of this Panel, the only immediate recourse is enactment of legislation to authorize pretrial detention of certain persons who pose a serious danger to the community. We endorse legislation which will authorize pretrial detention of hard core dangerous criminals who are awaiting trial for armed crimes. Detention should be imposed in cases where the defendant's record for violence indicates high probability of additional crimes of violence if released on bail. Further, it is absolutely essential that any system of pretrial detention include all appropriate Constitutional safeguards. Finally, detention shall not exceed 60 days.

Pretrial detention is not a "cheap" solution to the crime problem. Properly limited, it is a Constitutional, realistic approach to our crime problem. First, it takes cognizance of the fact that even if speedy trials are provided, there are still persons who pose a great danger to the community if released on bail for any period of time. Second, it recognizes that our present system of justice will not be speeded up overnight. New facilities, new judges, etc., will be slow in coming. In addition to other personnel, an adequate public defender system should be established to insure adequate representation for the defendants. Finally, pretrial detention is a realistic way to deal with repeated crime in a system which encourages delay. Speedy trial efforts simply have limited efficacy in a system where delay is often the best trial strategy.

In sum, pretrial detention offers an immediate response to armed violence and adds long-range rationality to our criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to these endorsements of the pretrial detention provision of the District of Columbia crime bill because the news media and even some members of this body, and of the other body, have disseminated so much misinformation about the provisions of this anticrime legislation that numerous citizens are being misguided as to its intent and effect. In this regard I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a recent WMAL editorial endorsing the pretrial detention provision and I applaud the Evening Star Broadcasting Co. for setting the record straight on this section of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask both the account of Judge Hart's testimony and the WMAL editorial will be printed at this point in the RECORD:

ERVIN HEARS ATTACK—JUDGE RAPS BAIL REFORM ACT

(By William Grigg)

Judge George L. Hart of the U.S. District Court here told Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. today that the senator's 1966 Bail Reform Act has permitted rapes, armed robberies and attempts at murder that otherwise could have been prevented.

The North Carolina Democrat's act requires that federal judges consider only a suspect's likelihood of flight, not his dangerousness, in setting bail.

Hart said this protected Kenneth H. Jackson, who was released on personal bond after

he had been caught by police as he held up a man at knifepoint on 14th Street NW.

BACKS PRETRIAL DETENTION

But, the judge continued, it did not protect the rights of the 16-year-old girl who was beaten and raped three weeks later. Jackson was identified as one of the three attackers, was rearrested and again released on personal recognizance as required by the Bail Reform Act. He was subsequently found guilty of both the robbery and the rape, Hart said.

Hart backed pretrial detention in such violent cases, a change proposed by the Nixon administration.

Ervin, chairman of the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on constitutional rights, opposes the change.

But Hart said such a position can be reached if one considers only the rights of the accused and not the rights of the victims. He listed 14 cases in which persons were clearly identified in a violent crime but had to be released. The victims of their subsequent crimes, he said, included:

A woman who lived on 4th Street NW who was shot by a man she had previously identified as having pretended to be an apartment janitor, entered her apartment to make a repair and then bound her up at knifepoint and raped her. The man she identified was released under the Bail Reform Act.

The employes at a Safeway at 1731 7th St. NW who were held up by an armed man who had only two weeks before been caught escaping after an attempted armed robbery of a Northeast gas station but had been released under the Bail Reform Act pending his trial.

The employes of a Northeast food distributor who were held up by a man with a shotgun who had been arrested five weeks earlier for burglary, while already on bond for still another robbery, but was released under the Bail Reform Act.

Hart testified before Ervin's subcommittee as chairman of an 11-man committee appointed by the Judicial Council here to study the operation of Ervin's Bail Reform Act.

Ervin noted after the testimony that Hart's group had only backed pre-trial detention by vote of 6 to 5.

WMAL EDITORIAL

A climate of hysteria is being attached to the D.C. Crime Bill before it even clears conference committee. Extreme statements about one section tend to drag down the entire much-needed bill. While we have previously expressed reservations about the no-knock clause, controversy over that one provision should not diminish the chances of the vital preventive detention section. There are deep philosophical splits over the wisdom of detaining individuals who may be a threat to the community. But the seriousness of the local crime situation demands action that will go beyond statistics and arguments. The conference committee should vote out the anti-crime bill with preventive detention immediately. If the legislation is unconstitutional, it will be decided quickly by the courts. The proper test is not in a hearing chamber or in statistical surveys . . . but by giving the anti-crime bill a chance.

NAUGATUCK AND BABE RUTH LEAGUE BASEBALL

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 17, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to honor the world's largest regulation teenage baseball pro-

gram, a program noted not only for its excellent quality of baseball, but for its basic ideals of good sportsmanship, fair play, and competitive spirit. Since its formation in 1951, Babe Ruth League baseball has provided valuable supervised recreation for thousands of young men. I would also like to congratulate our State championship baseball team, the Greyhounds of Naugatuck High. The town of Naugatuck, Conn., in my district, also has an excellent Babe Ruth League program, providing championship quality instruction every year.

The history of Babe Ruth baseball is one of steady growth, involving not only its ballplayers, but Government leaders, educators, recreation superintendents, and coaches. Almost 250,000 youngsters, from every State, participated in the 1969 season. The league also achieved international status, fielding teams in Europe, Guam, and Asia.

Named after the immortal Yankee great, the Babe Ruth League has successfully embodied the qualities of good baseball, physical fitness, and mental fitness. Babe Ruth baseball is played on regulation diamonds, within the framework of major league rules. Quality instruction provides youngsters with knowledge of and practice in baseball skills. Equally important, participants develop a genuine respect for accepted traditions of sportsmanship and competition. The Babe Ruth baseball program exists for young men. Through active group participation, Babe Ruth players develop not only their physical skills, but their character. They learn how to win, they learn how to accept defeat, and not to give up when faced with defeat.

Mr. Speaker, the Naugatuck High School baseball team has just recently shown how valuable such qualities can be. Behind 3 to 1 after eight full innings of play, the Greyhounds displayed their determination not to fold when the chips were down, and successfully pulled out a victory in the Connecticut State championship tournament. In their uphill win, the Naugy players displayed those same qualities which make Babe Ruth League baseball so valuable—a good knowledge of basic baseball principles, hustle, discipline, and the genuine character that team baseball helps develop.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate both the Babe Ruth League and the Connecticut champion Naugatuck High School Greyhounds for their excellent programs of organized baseball. Such programs successfully fulfill an important recreational need at this key stage in a young man's life.

I include an editorial comment on the Naugatuck championship team which recently appeared in the Naugatuck News:

IT'S NICE TO WIN

In a championship game to end a tournament, someone has to win and someone has to lose.

Naugatuck fans have found that it's nicer to win!

Wednesday evening the Naugatuck High School Greyhounds found themselves after eight full innings of play at the short end of the scoring, 3 to 1, which was just about opposite of the situation a year ago when the same Naugy nine was one pitch away from victory and the opponents came to life and won.

This year, however, the Greyhounds were not to be denied. After 21 straight victories to earn their way to the final game, the players didn't lose their poise when the chips were down.

Coaches Ray Legenza and Joe Bojko deserve votes of thanks from all Naugatuck—players, parents, fans and school administrators—for teaching that perseverance, intestinal fortitude, hard work, long hours of practice, the will to win, the determination to do a good job, etc., pays off to these 20 boys who made up the varsity squad that won the Class "A" title.

It was a long road—one that began back in early April—for the Greyhounds to go through 22 straight games without a defeat, making it only the second state high school team to accomplish the feat.

On that journey, the Naugy nine racked up opponents sometimes easily, sometimes finding the competition tough—but always coming out on top.

The 22 wins included the taking of the Naugatuck Valley League crown for the second year in a row without a defeat and the demolition of several opponents along the way, sometimes by astonishing scores.

The '70 Greyhounds will be remembered as a team that went through the 18-game regular season unbeaten and rolled over their foes by combined scores of 160 to 28, out-hitting them by a 172 to 85 margin. In the four additional tournament games, the Greyhounds out-scored their opponents by a 13 to 6 margin and barely out-hit them by a 19 to 18 mark.

Which latter fact brings up to a point we'd like to make: Players who go through the Naugatuck High School baseball mill (Coach Legenza has not been noted as an easy mentor to please) come out with infinitely more knowledge about the game than boys who play for less demanding coaches.

Naugy players know first-hand the meaning of discipline; the meaning of hustle; how to strive for perfection. They learn basic baseball at its finest; how to hit-and-run, advance the runners, worry the opposition, play hard—and to win.

We're mighty proud of our title-winning Greyhounds, and the whole town is bustin' with pride about 'em, too. We're proud to live in a town that takes its athletics seriously, knowing that team participation is a great moral and character-builder for the youth of our country.

But we can't help noting, as this season ended on a winning note, compared to last year's final-game loss, that it's a little bit nicer to win.

The successful season is a great tribute to a fine coach, a good athletic system at Naugatuck High School and to a great bunch of fine young men who will be our leaders of tomorrow, on and off the diamond.

SMALL BUSINESS MAN AN OLD FARM BOY

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration was created 17 years ago during the administration of President Dwight Eisenhower.

One of Mr. Eisenhower's first appointments to the SBA was Mr. C. I. Moyer. "C. I.," I am happy to report is still serving as the regional director for the four States of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska. He still runs his

Kansas City office with the affection and ability of a man dedicated to serving the needs of the people.

A recent feature story about C. I. Moyer that appeared in the Kansas City Star, reveals some most interesting sidelights, not only about Moyer the man, but also about Moyer the small business man, which makes him properly stand tall.

The article follows:

THE FEDERAL BEAT—SMALL BUSINESS MAN AN OLD FARM BOY

(By Bill Moore)

One of the things C. I. Moyer likes about his job is that his regular paid staff is augmented by about 200 gung-ho volunteers who stand by, ready to spring into action at a moment's notice and pull off a piece of work for his agency.

Moyer is regional director of the Small Business Administration; offices high up in the old Federal Office building at 911 Walnut street, with what would be a wonderful view from his window except that it looks straight into the back side of the big new Commerce Tower.

Mr. Moyer is a most friendly fellow and I have known him or at least known of him since his old political days out in Kansas and if I knew how to spell it I would set down his first name as it is known to all his friends. They pronounce his name as "sligh," which is, of course, a contraction of the initials, "C" and "I," but whether you would write it Ci, Sy, Sligh, or something else has never been determined.

As the federal government's Small Business man in Missouri, Kansas, Iowa and Nebraska, Mr. Moyer deals in money and is a man who is known to all the bankers and lenders, and a man to be consulted.

But money is a shadowy topic to me. All I know about money is that I have got a steady paycheck twice a month for a great many years and that the "deducts" keep getting larger. I am lost in talk of high finance.

I would rather say that almost 40 years ago I worked on a small newspaper in North Central Kansas and that there was a wheat farmer who dropped in once in a while to talk to the boss about politics. He wore blue denim overalls, blue denim shirt, and had a manner as though he was on the way up. I figured he was. His name was Frank Carlson.

And I think it was about that time I began to hear about another young fellow, not a whole lot older than me, who was believed to be on the way up and already making quite a figure in Republican politics. His name was Moyer.

C. I. or CI if you prefer, originated on a farm between Severance and Highland, Kans., and at an early age took to serving on township boards and such. In those days, if my memory serves, a chief function of a township board was to see to it that the dirt roads were kept graded. I did a little grading myself in those days. It was a dusty job, but not too demanding.

I suppose he must have been a Republican precinct committeeman. Anyhow with a law degree from the University of Kansas behind him and a farm and a record of community service as a power base, he got elected to the Kansas Legislature in 1938. Then he got elected to the Kansas Senate in 1940, served four years and made friends with everyone.

He was Ed Arn's campaign manager when Ed was elected governor in 1950 and again in 1952. And in 1952, Ci Moyer was one of the big men in Kansas close to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. And as state Republican chairman when Ike took over as President, Ci Moyer was indeed on very solid ground.

He was appointed regional director of the SBA in October, 1953. He maintained his home in Kansas (still lives in Fairway) but

the step across the state line, for business purposes, was not a hard one. Ci always had a lot of friends on the Missouri side.

Ci Moyer rode out the Democratic years and now that we again have a Republican administration his situation couldn't look better.

The Small Business Administration has changed its complexion somewhat since Moyer took over the Kansas City office nearly 17 years ago. For one thing (and this probably was inevitable) the volume of loans which it has a finger in is more than 10 times that of 1953.

On the other hand the SBA has been getting out of the direct loan business. It is virtually out right now, Moyer says. What it does is tell the guy to go to the bank and borrow the money and the SBA will assure the bank that it will be safe enough just in case—just in the possible case—the guy won't be able to pay off as expeditiously as he hoped.

Of course, the loan client is checked out by the SBA before he is directed to the bank. The SBA tries to make certain that he's a reasonable sort of a risk.

The SBA does a lot of counseling with small business men these days; much more than it used to. If the small business man is having trouble the SBA tries to show him how he can maybe work himself out of it.

And finally those volunteers: They're members of the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE, since the government is eternally searching for acronyms), and they are at the ready when it comes to giving management assistance to small business men in trouble. There's about 100 of these SCORE members in Iowa alone.

They serve pretty much for free, although it's said they are reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expense.

Ci Moyer's grandfather homesteaded a tract of 80 acres which today is a part of the present 320-acre farm. On weekends you'll find our SBA man up there on the Doniphan County farm poking around among his cattle and looking down the corn rows.

THIRTY YEARS OF SUFFERING FOR THE BALTIC STATES

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Baltic peoples have suffered under Soviet captivity for over 30 years. Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia lost their freedom and independence when the Soviets invaded and occupied these peace-loving countries on June 15, 1940.

Last Monday, we as Members of Congress, marked this sad anniversary. However, the dream of liberty still remains for the beleaguered men and women in the Baltic nations. House Concurrent Resolution 416 was unanimously adopted by the House and Senate in 1966. It called for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Regrettably, the sense of this resolution has not as yet been fulfilled. The implementation of House Concurrent Resolution 416 is long overdue and I fervently urge that the President now take the initiative by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjugation of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation

constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

TIPS ON FIGHTING POLLUTION

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent essay on the causes and cures of pollution was published last June 7 in the San Diego Union under the title, "Giving the Earth a Chance."

Beverly Beyette, the writer, has thoroughly researched the multitude of threats to the environment, both generally and in the San Diego area. And Miss Beyette has done her usual superior work in reporting the story.

The article includes some suggestions on how anyone can help curb pollution. Among these tips:

Use only white paper products because dyes pollute the water.

Return metal coathangers to the cleaner.

Do not buy anything in a nonreturnable container.

Do not use DDT.

Use plastic garbage pails because they are quieter.

Ride the bus to work.

Use live Christmas trees and replant them.

If you want more than two children, adopt them.

While all of the above thoughts might not be well received by everybody, I am reasonably confident that anybody can find at least several items in the list that make sense to him. If we all would adopt

even just a few of these proposals, I imagine the pollution problem would start to take care of itself.

Miss Beyette's account follows:

GIVING THE EARTH A CHANCE

(By Beverly Beyette)

The young, the first major group to take up the environmental crusade, have a slogan: "Give earth a chance."

In the broad sense, it is man, himself, for whom they seek a chance. Some believe it is his last.

Only now has man begun to realize that he does not have dominion over the earth and every creeping thing, that he is dependent on all of these for his very existence and that they, in turn, are dependent one on the other. Scientists call this interdependence, this delicately balanced web of life, ecology. Already, the word has been overworked. We will hear more and more of eco-systems, of eco-catastrophes.

We will hear, again and again, that man is doomed, that he may not survive beyond the year 2000. But man is a surprisingly adaptable creature. He has survived, and reproduced, in the most adverse of circumstances.

The future is somewhere between the prophets of doom with their dire predictions of the end of mankind and the smug complacency of those who know that technology, which got us into this mess, will get us out of it.

Was Earth Day—April 22, 1970—a fleeting salute to Mother Nature, or was it truly a mandate for environmental action?

This is the challenge to America.

Thus, we are embarked on the war against pollution. It is a unique battle in that it has had some success in bridging the generation gap. But it has also polarized whites and blacks, establishment and non-establishment, rich and poor. The "little people" have been quick to blame big business for pollution, even though it is the insatiable appetite of the "little people," as consumers, that has kept big business big.

Kahlil Gibran has written of "the lust for comfort, that stealthy thing that enters the house a guest, and then becomes a host, and then a master."

Where did it all start? There are those who would trace man's embattled relationship with his environment to his primeval urge to have, and to hoard, because things meant survival.

As time went on, technology gave him the means to produce even more of the things he needed and, eventually, those he did not need, but wanted. It was only a matter of time before his thing-oriented technology would overwhelm his environment.

To grow bigger and better crops, he tampered with the soil, he overloaded the environment with herbicides and pesticides. He cut down the forests, dumped industrial wastes into the rivers and contaminated the air with the byproducts of his treasured automobile and other creature comforts.

And, as he destroyed, he multiplied. Clearly, the basic environmental problem in the world today is too many people. Dr. Fred Singer, deputy secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, sees the two as so inseparable that he calls it population.

Today, world population is estimated at 3.4 billion, heading for 7 billion by the year 2000. Projections are that, in the same 30-year period, U.S. population, now 204 million, will reach 300 million. As the United States grows, the great concentration of growth has been in Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii, Florida—and, of course, California.

In 1910, there were 2.4 million people in California; in 1930, 5.6 million. By 1940, the Golden State had a population of 6.9 million. Today there are 20 million and the forecast for the year 2000 is 50 million.

This year the city of San Diego reached

711,000 giving it new status as the nation's 14th most populous city and the second largest in California—and giving local environmentalists added cause for alarm.

And on and on they come—1,000 people a day pouring into California. (Consider that, in 1940, San Diego had a population of 203,341). The state's new Environmental Quality Study Council has called for a moratorium on freeways and water projects in an effort to slow the state's dizzying growth and has termed "urgent" the immediate adoption of a population distribution policy.

The 1970 census is expected to show that almost half of the American people are under 30. "Our young are inheriting the earth," says former Interior Secretary Stewart Udall. "Their inheritance is a bitter one. On every hand, they see the ravages this affluent, industrial-technological society, built by previous generations has worked upon the natural order of our surroundings." It seems only appropriate that the young are the most committed.

The population problem is not a problem restricted to the poor. Bureau of the Census statistics shows that it is to the middle class that two thirds of the 3.5 million babies born in the United States each year are born. Some of the militant minorities resist birth control as a white racist plot. There is considerable opposition to the entire environmental thrust among Negroes who would prefer to see the money spent in the ghetto. The per capita consumption by Negroes, and thus the per capita pollution, is considerably lower than among whites.

Nonetheless, per capita income in the United States has doubled in the last 40 years through increased output which, in turn, has added to the environmental load.

There are two proposals by State Sen. Anthony Bellenson (D-Beverly Hills) before the state legislature that could have significant impact on the California population boom. One would legalize abortions as a matter of "individual conscience"; the other would provide tax incentives for small families by limiting state income tax deductions to two children. (Sen. Robert Packwood (R-Oregon), has introduced a bill to limit federal income tax deductions to three children.)

With two million illegal abortions performed in the United States in 1969, there is growing pressure for legalized abortion. The Abortion Counseling Service of San Diego County, a volunteer-staffed referral service that went into operation shortly after passage of the state's Therapeutic Abortion Act in late 1967, reports that it averages 50 inquiries a week.

In creating a Commission on Population Growth, President Nixon said, ". . . I believe that many of our present social problems may be related to the fact that we have had only 50 years in which to accommodate the second 100 million Americans . . . and now it appears that we will have to provide for a third 100 million Americans in a period of just 30 years."

Ecologists, like Stanford University biologist Dr. Paul Ehrlich, author of "The Population Bomb," say the world is doomed if population is not controlled. Ehrlich heads Zero Population Growth (ZPG), an organization dedicated to keeping the population stabilized by adding only enough citizens to replace those who die. The generally agreed upon family size for achieving this goal in the United States is 2.3 children.

Meanwhile, says Ehrlich, the United States, with a doubling time of 63 years, produces and consumes material goods at such a disproportionate rate that, if the trend continues, by 1990 Americans will be less than 1-15th of the world population, but may be consuming 80 per cent of its resources.

He asks, "Will other countries, many of them in the grip of starvation and anarchy, still happily supply these materials to a nation that cannot give them food?"

In their book, "Moment in the Sun," Robert and Leona Rienow write, "We are scarcely in a position to give the world lectures in population restraint. We have unflaggingly buttressed the sexual drive with billion-dollar commercial stimulation. Our ads belabor us day and night to keep ourselves bathed, pomaded and perfumed for the sole purpose of alluring the other sex. We work, drive, eat and play to the accompaniment of love ballads. Corn plasters, automobiles and beer have been endowed with sex appeal."

Biologist Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis, has said that, if widespread famine is avoided, there will be 6 to 8 billion people on earth by 2000—and that the earth's absolute limit is 8 billion. He observes that people will voluntarily limit the size of their families only when they have the sense of security that comes from knowing they need not have as many offspring as possible to take care of them in their old age. This, says Commoner, means the "haves" among nations sharing with the "have nots."

Dr. Michael Soule, a UCSD biologist who was a student of Ehrlich at Stanford and is now collaborating with him on a textbook, suggests, "The government can tell us we can only have one wife. It can damned well tell us we can only have two children."

What are the sociologic and economic implications of a burgeoning population? In "Moment in the Sun," the Rienows see it this way: Every eight seconds a new American is born. He will want in 70 years: 56 million gallons of water, 21,000 gallons of gasoline, 10,150 lbs. of meat, 28,000 lbs. of milk and cream, 9,000 lbs. of wheat and 31,500 lbs. of pulpwood in paper products.

He will also have to be educated, clothed and fed. This will average out to \$8,000 worth of schooling, \$6,000 worth of clothing and \$7,000 worth of furniture. Unless there is a devastating war, electric power production will increase five times by the year 2000, building will increase five times and there will be 244 million automobiles on America's roads.

Today the United States consumes half of the world's goods. The Rienows observe that Americans passed a milestone in the late 1960s: This became a nation in which spending of the after-tax dollar for luxuries exceeded spending for necessities. Conversely, our position in the world's market shifted in the '40s. We stopped producing as many raw materials as we were consuming.

San Diego Judge Hugo Fisher, former administrator of the state resources agency, has predicted that, within 15 years, the United States will have about 9.5 per cent of the world's population and will be consuming about 83 per cent of its raw materials and resources.

Historian Arthur A. Ekirch Jr. has said of the American nation: "Probably no people have ever so quickly subdued their natural environment."

Udall notes that each time the United States proclaims a small increase in the standard of living, the gross national product or the population, "We are really creating a large increase in industrial and human pollution and a large increase in the decay of the human condition."

Herein lies a dilemma: Jobs for the jobless means more production which, in turn, means more pollution.

To see the threat of mass starvation as the only threat in an overpopulated world is a misunderstanding, says George Wald of Harvard University, a Nobel prize winner in physiology and medicine. The point, says Wald, is not how many people can be fed, but what population can best fulfill its human potentialities. "One is not interested in the quantity, but in the quality of human life. From that point of view, the world is probably already overpopulated."

At the dedication of USC's Seaver Science Center in January, Governor Reagan expressed optimism that Americans may "find the proper balance—the right mix—between technological progress and spiritual maturity, so that the two can walk in proper partnership."

The challenge, then, will be to find that mix. Kingsley Davis, director of international population and urban research at UC, Berkeley (and originator of the phrase "zero population growth"), says, "I see no value in the idea that we should reduce our level of living to that of India, just so that we can have as many people as India. If our drain on the world's resources is too great, I'd rather reduce the number of people than the level of living."

The Interior Department's Singer says, "We have to develop further technology to overcome the unwanted byproducts of our primary technology." His is the camp of environmentalists who argue that it is technology that allows us to reclaim waste water, to clean up the lakes, to search for a successor to the internal combustion engine.

University of Colorado's Kenneth Boulding, in "Economics of the Coming Space Age Earth," voices concern that there are among us men who say, "Why worry about all this . . . let us eat, drink, spend, extract and pollute, and be as merry as we can, and let posterity worry about the space age earth." To them, there is but one answer, says Boulding: They must identify with some human community or society.

Dr. Rene Dubos of Rockefeller University, a renowned ecologist and Nobel Prize winner for his book, "So Human An Animal," says, "Until last year it was almost universally taken for granted that more and more technology doing more of the same faster and faster was the only way to improve human life."

He blames this on the long prevalent American attitude that man must conform to science and technology when, in reality, man should have been using science and technology to develop living conditions suited to his fundamental nature.

Says Boulding, "We probably know more about the economics of the environment, surprisingly enough than about its biology and physics. Thus, he points out, it is easy to develop environmental scares, but very hard to evaluate them."

While big business is bringing in environmental experts, these experts tend to demonstrate greater loyalty to their employer than to the public interest. Legal sanctions against polluters, both on local and national scales, tend to lack muscle. The Santa Barbara oil leak, for example, brought no penalties against Union Oil Co.

As man comes to grips with his environment, says Dubos, his concern is not that man is going to be destroyed ("human beings are incredibly adaptable,") but that "progressively we're becoming more and more tolerant of conditions which make life less and less human."

Unlike Ehrlich, Dubos does not see stabilization of the population in itself as the answer. He says a more immediate problem is our increasing use of energy (at a rate of 9 per cent annually). This, he says, cannot go on for another decade without ecological disaster from overheating of the natural systems.

Dr. Edward D. Goldberg of Scripps Institution of Oceanography believes that perhaps the most terrifying aspect of the ecological crisis is the absence of "appropriate institutions, either national or international, to cope on a continuing basis with the problems of an increasingly polluted environment."

The universities, says Goldberg, are too departmentalized and success in them "depends on doing terribly well in a specialty," while what is needed is an interdisciplinary attack

by researchers who have made a fulltime commitment.

Government agencies, says Goldberg, each have their own goals and cling to them tenaciously. For example, the Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries might lock horns with the World Health Organization over a ban on DDT.

As ethics and morality are involved in the pollution battle, says Goldberg, psychologists and sociologists are needed as well as scientists—the psychologists to predict and influence people's reactions, the sociologists to provide demographic input and make priority judgments such as whether to clean up air in the inner city before cleaning up air in the suburbs.

"The great scientists," says Goldberg, "are those who work on solvable problems." Among these problems he lists management of oil spills and pesticide control. "Clearly, we are going to have mass starvations," he says, "I don't consider that a solvable problem on a short-term basis."

Singer acknowledges that "the government does not now speak with one voice." While the Interior Department is promoting conservation, he says, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is giving welfare bonuses to large families. One goal of the Nixon administration, says Singer, will be to establish a general plan. Interior Secretary Walter Hickel would like to see a U.S. Department of Natural Resources and Environment.

Environmental activists are concerned that enthusiasm for their crusade will dwindle when the crusade faces some of life's practical realities. Ehrlich says that if the battle is lost, it will be for two reasons: Nothing undeveloped can long stand in the face of the population explosion and most Americans clearly don't give a damn.

Dubos recognizes that, even though the over-30 generation may be "prisoners of their own lives," the environmental movement at the youth level is intense. He estimates that 20 per cent of today's college students will have a lifetime commitment and that today's high school students are being so conditioned that, as young adults, they will be able to effect an environmental reversion within 20 years. The earth movement, says Dubos, "is going to spread all over the world in the next five years."

The President, in his State of the Union address, said, "The great question of the '70's is, shall we surrender to our surroundings, or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, our land and our water?" The President has established a cabinet committee on the environment and also a three-man Council on Environmental Quality. There is widespread concern, however, that the federal commitment can be no more than lip service so long as federal policies directly detrimental to the environment continue.

Commoner, author of "Science and Survival," has suggested that the President declare a national ecological emergency, that he increase federal support to the scientific research, halt development of the supersonic transport, stop exploitation of oil deposits in Alaska and off the California coast until a way is found to insure against ecological disaster.

Recently directing his efforts to the environment has been consumer advocate Ralph Nader, whose "Nader's Raiders" have been zeroing in on pesticides and on air and water pollution. Nader says corporate investment in development of pollution controls should be required by law according to the amount of pollution initiated by the individual business or industry. He points out that, while General Motors grossed \$24 billion in 1969, the company spent less than \$15 million on vehicle and plant pollution research

and development, even though its products and plants contribute some 35 percent of the nation's air pollution by tonnage.

Fortune magazine, in a recent issue on the environment, suggested the possibility of tax breaks or matching government grants for industrial pollution control. In the long range, said Fortune, pollution control could reduce industry's costs by making cities more livable so that employes would accept lower wages to work in them. By the same token, says Fortune, pollution abatement could increase the GNP through reduced absenteeism, fewer sick leave and death benefits, lower personnel turnover and lower accruent training costs. Industry, said the magazine, is going to have to put money on the environment instead of on fringe benefits and wage increases.

Society as a whole, says Fortune, is paying huge subsidies to those who pollute free air and water. It suggests a graduated federal tax on pollutants to stimulate them to develop anti-pollution techniques.

Nonetheless, while ecologists plead for a "quality of life" concept to replace the standard of living concept, Americans continue to buy. They buy automobiles and they buy electric toothbrushes and electric carving knives and electric shoe polishers. Christmas, says The Environmental Handbook, has become "a materialistic environmental rip-off."

Asks Commoner, "How many pairs of shoes does a man require? How much horsepower does he need in his car?"

But there is another side to the coin. Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, science adviser to the President, says, "I strongly reject the idea that we have to destroy our technological civilization, deflate and decrease the standard of living to improve the quality of life. There may be a few who would like to return to the days of the caveman, but most of us believe that men live healthier, more pleasant lives today than they did 10,000, or even 100 years ago." Many Americans would be quick to agree.

The consumer pays more than he realizes for the luxuries he buys, says Commoner. He estimates that industrial pollution adds about 25 per cent to the city dweller's electric bill in such hidden costs as laundry bills and doctor bills.

We are witnessing "the birth of the industrial-government-pollution complex," says SDSC zoologist Dr. John Todd. This is a complex, he says, that "may slow man's rate of extinction; it will not prevent it."

Todd believes that "fully 90 per cent of technology is phony and most objects break or are obsolete before they are off the assembly line. We must reject this out of hand. We must use only the valid 10 per cent like computers, generators, stereos, movie cameras and the Pill. These are extensions of our senses and they enrich our lives without jeopardizing our lifespaces."

There are students of the politics of ecology who argue that the destruction of the environment is not simply a byproduct of progress in an industrial-technological society, rather, that environmental deterioration is a product of an economic, cultural and social system that sustains itself through destruction of the physical world. They like to point out that the proportion of the federal budget spent on natural resources programs has declined since 1965—while the federal government subsidizes the SST and maintains the depletion allowance for offshore oil drilling.

How much will it cost to clean up the environment? Some studies indicate that costs over the next generation may go beyond \$1,000 billion just to keep up with population growth. Sen. Nelson speaks of an expenditure of \$275 billion by the year 2000, which would be roughly equivalent to defense spending for the next four years.

Lack of organization, as well as lack of funds, has caused some conservation groups to flounder. They have stubbed their toes

because of their tendency to attack isolated problems while ignoring regional problems with far-reaching social and political implications.

California's Environmental Quality Study Council, in its recent recommendations, stated it will take "almost superhuman political will" to adopt policies good for the majority that will be unpopular with powerful vested interests.

Dr. Gordon J. MacDonald, vice chancellor, US-Santa Barbara, and a member of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, has called for a Presidential moratorium on all federal projects which affect the environment in any major way unless these projects are deemed essential to the public interest at this time. He advocates similar action by state governors—all designed to provide a breather until effective tools for dealing with environmental management can be developed.

Meanwhile, the environmentalists pass along a few tips on how you can help, among these: Use only white paper products (dyes pollute the water). Don't junk metal coat-hangers; return them to the cleaner. Don't buy anything in a nonreturnable container. Don't use DDT. Buy a plastic garbage pail (it's less noisy). Take a bus to work. Avoid disposable diapers. Use live Christmas trees and replant them. Put a brick in your toilet tank. If you want more than two children, adopt them.

People are doing something about pollution—that is the important thing.

UCSD's Bureau of Environmental Design is publishing a monthly Environmental Crisis Bulletin that tells people what to do about pollution, how to do it and who to turn to for help.

The San Diego County Department of Education has applied for a \$15,000 federal grant to develop, in cooperation with Orange County schools, a program to assess the ecological problems of the state and to develop appropriate instructional materials for use in all of this county's 600 schools.

Citizens Coordinate for Century III, a revamped group that developed from the beautification-conscious Citizens Coordinate, is directing its efforts to citizen involvement in the whole broad scale of San Diego environmental problems. Smaller groups, like Ocean Beach Ecology Action, are zeroing in on localized problems.

Throughout the nation, college campuses are giving birth to groups such as Nature's Conspiracy, the North American Habitat Preservation Society and Group Against Smelter Pollution (better known as GASP).

Increasingly, pollution is becoming a legal issue. Students from U.S. law schools have formed a National Environmental Law Society to coordinate efforts of attorneys who are bringing suit on environmental issues and to assist groups working for environmental legislation.

Says Nader, "The forced consumption of industrial pollutants by 200 million Americans must lead to a recognition of legal rights in environmental control such as that which developed with civil rights for racial minorities over the last two decades."

Dedication of the few has been fervent. If the war against pollution is lost, it will be through indifference of the many.

voting age should be lowered, I voted against the House proposal for two major reasons. First, the overwhelming majority of voters in the 18th District who have expressed an opinion on the subject oppose reducing the age limit. I base this conclusion on the letters, telegrams, phone calls, and personal conversations, I have had on the subject. These have generally tended to confirm the results of the voter opinion poll I conducted last summer. Second, I agree with President Nixon that any change in the voting age should be made by constitutional amendment and not mere statute. However, since Congress has made the change by statute, the constitutionality of its action is questionable, and for this reason, the legality of the 18-year-old vote will have to be tested in the courts.

Our Government is founded on laws, not men. Consequently, since the U.S. Constitution provides that States rather than the Federal Government have the primary authority to establish voting age limitations, I believe the Government ignores the Constitution and acts as the mood moves it, to that extent the sovereign rights of the 50 States are diminished. We have seen far too much erosion of States rights in recent years, the 91st Congress should not contribute further to this unfortunate trend toward centralized government.

The reasons why I voted against the proposal to lower the voting age, however, do not affect my personal evaluation of the concept itself. I believe persons old enough to fight for our country are old enough to vote. Throughout this century, young men have borne the brunt of our national defense. In Vietnam, this point has been driven home with stark clarity. With the aid of modern computers, for the first time casualties of war have been broken down in age groupings. According to the Department of Defense, 38,864 American soldiers were killed in action as of last September. In the 18-to-30 age group, the fatalities broke down as follows:

18	2,373
19	6,213
20	10,139
21	6,449
22	3,215
23	2,359
24	1,762
25	1,309
26	869
27	526
28	428
29	400
30	317

This means that of all the Americans killed in Vietnam as of the beginning of the 1969-70 school year, over 65 percent were between the ages of 18 and 21.

As of June 4, 1970, 42,534 Americans were killed in action, and 280,782 were wounded. It is safe to say that well over half of the individuals who made these sacrifices were too young to vote under present laws. They were not too young to fight, to die, to spend the rest of their lives crippled or lying in a veterans' home, but they were too young to vote. I believe this condition should be rectified.

I also believe that due to rising levels of education, youths of today are better qualified to vote than the youth of past

VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that I personally feel the

generations. We all are well aware of instances of lawless behavior by some young people, particularly on college campuses, but we must not let the media blind us to our young. Over half of all 18- to 20-year-olds are not in college at all, instead they work and pay taxes—about 1 million serve in the Armed Forces, and more than 1 million are housewives. A presidential commission has reported that less than 2 percent of all college students can be classified as militants or radicals. The Justice Department has determined that many so-called hard-core campus radicals are over 21; for example, all of the infamous Chicago 7 are well over 21.

Mr. Speaker, in the main, the youth of today are responsible citizens who yearn to fully take part in the political processes that govern our country. I believe they are entitled to participate. I believe they should participate. But I do not believe the spirit of the Constitution should have been distorted to provide them this privilege.

This legislation also contained provisions extending the 1965 Voting Rights Act. In the first session of this Congress I voted for the administration's National Voting Rights Act which would have given voting rights protections to residents of the 50 States rather than focusing Federal regulation unfairly on our sister Southern States as does the 1965 act.

A FAMILY TRAGEDY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, a very tragic situation has developed concerning Alan and Margaret McSurely, a young husband and wife caught up in a process which makes them victims. It is described in detail in an article to be found in the Nation, December 30, 1968, and I recommend it to my colleagues. The article is timely now because the criminal proceedings arising out of the so-called contempt of Congress citation are to take place on Monday, June 22, 1970, in the U.S. district court in Washington, D.C.

The article follows:

STRIPPING KENTUCKY—THE "SUBVERSIVE" POOR

(By Gene L. Mason)

LEXINGTON.—Eastern Kentucky is in the heartland of Appalachia and has all the attributes associated with that colonized poverty pocket. The state of Kentucky not only has 40 per cent of the nation's one-room schoolhouses but its children suffer the highest TB rate in the nation. Almost one-fourth of the east Kentucky population over 24 is illiterate.

During the Kennedy administration, numerous anti-poverty programs were pulled from the drawing tables. We all thought we had declared war on poverty and, to some extent, on the social system that perpetuates it. But aside from the fact that the national leadership gave the war in Vietnam priority over the war in Appalachia, other contradictions are inherent in any attempt by the federal government to destroy poverty.

In eastern Kentucky one of those contradictions is a reflection of the economic system. Coal is the basic industry, and the Tennessee Valley Authority is by far the single largest buyer. The poor people do not profit from the industry—they have been ruined by it. There is an estimated 35 billion tons of coal beneath the rocky, mountainous surface of eastern Kentucky, and only 2 billion tons of it have been mined in more than half a century. Yet ten of the twenty poorest counties in the nation are in eastern Kentucky. Pike County, the largest coal-producing county in this country, is among them. Last year, 18,267,200 tons of coal were mined in Pike County alone. Coal brings the mine owners from \$3 to \$15 per ton, depending on the grade. Even at the lowest rate, this one county produces \$50 million worth of coal in one year.

That wealth has done almost nothing for the people of the county. In the words of Harry Caudill of Whitesburg, Ky., attorney and author, "Today welfare, not mining, provides most of the money spent by families in the nation's coal fields." To understand how such poverty can exist amid such wealth one must recognize the relationship between the owners of coal companies and the county power structure—they are virtually the same. Poverty in eastern Kentucky is a political problem. None of the federally funded anti-poverty programs officially recognize it as such, but some come closer than others.

Eighteen months ago the Appalachian Volunteers (AVs) hired as its training director Alan McSurely, a 30-year-old anti-poverty worker with an M.A. in psychology. He was fired three weeks later for his alleged manipulative and Leninist beliefs. McSurely had proposed various structural changes within the AV organization and had advocated direct political action as the only means to end poverty. He urged the staff to prepare itself for the day when federal money would be cut off if poor people in the mountains really began to get organized.

McSurely and his wife Margaret were then hired by the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF), a Louisville-based civil rights and anti-poverty organization, and remained in the mountains to organize. The AV staff began its work that summer sharply split among militants, moderates and a few genuine conservatives. However, the first issue in which they all joined forces was not long in coming. By mid-June, 1967, they were all working to organize poor people against strip mining—the most brutal and destructive aspect of the economic system. [See "Strip-Mine Morality: The Landscaping of Hell" by Wendell Berry, *The Nation*, January 24, 1966.]

Forty million tons of coal were stripped from Kentucky's pock-marked mountains last year—and most of that was purchased by the TVA. James Curry, Reclamation Director for TVA, apparently finds this a satisfactory relationship. "Strip mining is part of the American way," he said. He quickly rephrased his comment to "Strip mining is an integral aspect of the American economy."

Strip mining is certainly not desired, however, by the poor people who live on and around the land that is stripped. By a curious legal device known as the broad form deed, owners of the coal under the ground have rights superior to those who own the land above. In the early part of this century, the rights to this coal were purchased for a pittance from people who were completely ignorant of their potential value. The Kentucky Court of Appeals has upheld the rights of those who own the coal to destroy this land. A law setting limits on the degree of slope permissible for stripping, and providing for certain measures of land restoration, was passed during Democratic Gov. Edward Breathitt's administration three years ago. Strip miners declared that such

regulations would destroy the industry—but the acreage under strip mining continues to grow.

Not everyone is content, however. Periodically, strip miners discover that their equipment has been dynamited in the fields. In the hot summer months of 1967, night raiders blew up a \$50,000 diesel-powered shovel of the Kentucky Oak Coal Company at its stripping site in Knott County. In August, 1968, \$800,000 worth of stripping equipment was blasted in Bell County. Across the line in Tennessee, several bulldozers, an auger and a railroad car were dynamited the first week of December 1967. The total was more than \$1 million of "creative" destruction. Mine guards go armed, and random shooting from both sides is not uncommon.

Even more dramatic was the action of an owner of land about to be stripped in the summer months of 1967. Jink Ray, supported by neighbors, AVs and SCEF workers, decided to stand in front of the bulldozer as it was pulling onto his land. He did, and refused to budge; the dozer went away. After a series of legal battles in which the local courts issued injunctions against Ray to prevent his interference with the stripping of his own land, Governor Breathitt came to his aid. He had the strip mine permit of the Puritan Coal Company revoked. Joe Mulloy, an AV and one of Ray's neighbors, said that "the Jink Ray victory had tremendous implications for the poor and working class in Appalachia. This was perhaps the first time since the heyday of the United Mine Workers that the operators had been challenged and defeated by the people. Ray's victory could serve as an inspiration to people all over the mountains to demand and take back what is theirs, the coal. The coal operators knew this all too well."

Meanwhile, the AVs were receiving threatening phone calls in the middle of the night. Then, during the last week of July, 1967, the Pike County sheriff, a representative of the Small Business Administration, and Robert Holcomb, president of the Pikeville Chamber of Commerce, visited the homes of McSurely and Mulloy. They questioned Mulloy generally about what he was doing in Pike County, and specifically about strip mining. Their stay was short but long enough to suggest subtly that he'd better be careful. That evening Holcomb called for a federal investigation of the AVs in Pike County.

Then, on August 11, 1967, eight days after the revocation of the Puritan Coal Company's strip mine permit, the power of the coal companies was brought to bear. Alan McSurely's home was invaded by Commonwealth Attorney Thomas Ratliff (former president of ICOA) and fifteen armed deputies. They combed every piece of printed or written material in the home for two hours—especially the research library on the coal industry that the McSurelys had collected—and confiscated all of it. When they discovered that Margaret McSurely had worked for SNCC in 1964, they arrested her as well as her husband. By midnight they had reached Mulloy's home and put him under arrest.

The following morning, these three anti-poverty workers were taken from their jail cells and arraigned. Bond was set at \$5,000 for each of the two men. Margaret McSurely was six months pregnant; her bond was only \$2,000. Southern Bell Telephone immediately disconnected the phones in both homes. Mulloy's auto insurance with a local agent was canceled, and he was unable to get insurance for the next six months.

The word began to spread that those arrested were Communists. Holcomb told reporters: "We know that these people are Communists. There are no ifs, ands or buts about it. . . . They intend to take over the county." Ratliff then arrested Carl Braden

and his wife Ann, Executive Directors of SCEF, for attempting to overthrow the government of Pike County. Mrs. Braden had never set foot in the county, and her husband's only appearance there was to get McSurely and Mulloy out on bond.

Under the leadership of William Kunstler of Rutgers' Law Center for Constitutional Rights, the anti-poverty workers eventually managed to get the 1920 state sedition statute, which they had been charged with violating, declared unconstitutional. However, the local power structure had by then made plenty of political hay out of the matter.

Heavy pressure was put on Governor Breathitt to rid the state of AVs. Opposing the coal industry in Kentucky is risky politics. Breathitt succumbed and recommended to OEO Director Shriver that funds for AVs be cut off. On August 18, 1967, Shriver acted. He cut off all funds without a hearing and without notifying the AV director. Some funds were later reinstated, but the AVs have received no new funds from OEO.

A confidential OEO report laid the arrests principally to "obvious political interests." This corroborated an FBI report which stated that Ratliff's prime objective was "riding Pike County of the anti-poverty workers." It added, "Ratliff's reasons for attacking the program are economic and political: (1) he has made a fortune out of the coal industry and still had coal interests; and (2) he is running for Lt. Governor on the Republican ticket and thinks it is a good issue." But despite an agreement with the three-judge federal court not to act until the court could reach a decision on the constitutionality of the state sedition law, Ratliff proceeded with a Pike County grand jury investigation of the McSurleys and Mulloy. The people of Pike County were thereby sufficiently informed of how these outsiders were disrupting "legitimate" community interests.

Having now the declaration of unconstitutionality, the poverty workers (who had been forced to expend virtually all their energies defending themselves against personal attacks) thought they could return to organizing. However, at that point the federal government decided to get involved. In October, 1967, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations (the old Joe McCarthy committee), chaired by John McClellan, subpoenaed the McSurleys and the records Ratliff had seized on his midnight raid. The McClellan committee is at present charged with investigating the causes of urban riots, and McClellan has said that he has evidence that the SCEF workers were instrumental to the outbreak of riots in Nashville in April, 1967. (The SCEF staff had held its quarterly meeting there April 5 through 8. Stokely Carmichael had spoken at one of the sessions, probably providing the committee with the "evidence" it needed to link SCEF with the riots.)

The subpoenas were challenged in court as illegal, since they were the "fruit of a poison tree": the material had been taken illegally, under an unconstitutional law. The McClellan committee could not act until the material was returned to its rightful owners. (However, the committee's investigator had already made photostatic copies of all the material he wanted.)

After two trips had been made to the U.S. Supreme Court, the books and documents were finally returned last November. McClellan promptly served the McSurelys with new subpoenas, requiring that they appear in Washington with their material on January 14, 1969. The subpoena specifically requests only material pertaining to the Southern Students Organizing Committee (SSOC), the Student Nonviolent Coordinat-

ing Committee (SNCC), the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the National Conference for New Politics (NCNP), Vietnam Summer, the AVs, SCEF, and the United Planning Organization (UPO), an umbrella anti-poverty organization in Washington, D.C. The 1968 subpoena differed from the one issued in 1967 in only one respect: a request for materials relating to "all other Marxist-Leninist organizations" was deleted. It appears that the committee wishes to link in the public mind all of the very active civil rights and anti-poverty organizations with urban riots.

While the McSurelys were fighting the McClellan committee, Mulloy was fighting his draft board. (There was little time left to fight poverty.) Mulloy had attempted to apply for C.O. status after his 2-A classification had been revoked in the spring of 1967. His draft board in Louisville refused to reopen his case. In discussions with his board, he was questioned about his activities in eastern Kentucky, and the board kept a file of clippings on him and the AVs. (Somehow Mulloy's anti-poverty, anti-strip mining efforts seemed to be relevant to his draft status.) By refusing to reopen the file, the board in effect denied Mulloy the right to appeal. When it became apparent that he would be drafted, Mulloy decided to refuse induction. In April, 1968, he was given the maximum sentence. He spent six weeks in the county jail trying to get his bond lowered from \$12,000. He is now free while his case is being appealed.

Between the time Mulloy informed the AVs of his decision to refuse induction and his trial, the AVs, by a vote of 20 to 19, decided to fire him. Mulloy had been told by other AVs that the draft and the war in Vietnam were not issues that concerned the poor, and that he had jeopardized their program by his actions. Mulloy and his wife Karen joined the McSurelys on the SCEF staff.

Despite this incredible series of redbaiting and riotbaiting tactics by the city, county and federal officials, the anti-poverty workers still hoped for success. They continued their effort to organize the poor. And some of the AVs were beginning to sense just how political poverty is. Edith Easterling, a longtime local resident, an AV and director of the Marrowbone Folk School—a cinder-block center for organizing in Pike County—put it this way:

"You should see the way some of those county officers treat the people in the hollers. A friend of mine went down to the high sheriff's office and wanted to make some complaints cause we hadn't been getting any law enforcement. One night a young guy got cut in a fight at a dance at the Folk School. My friend went to the high sheriff's office and asked for help. The deputy said she was just a Communist, and she works for the AVs; and as long as they were going to be Communist, then they couldn't have anybody from the sheriff's office coming out there."

As usual, the winter was difficult in the mountains of Kentucky. But, when the Kentucky legislature met in early 1968, things became still worse. Legislators swallowed what they were fed by the Pike County power structure. The Southern Conference Education Fund was surely a Communist front organization. So must be the AVs. The new Governor, Republican Louis B. Nunn, made a campaign promise to "run SCEF and organizations like it out of the state." He was to get ample help from Democratic and Republican state legislators. To implement his promise, a Kentucky Un-American Activities Committee (KUAC) was established. When a controversy arose as to the need and source of funds for this committee and its proposed staff of investigators, Nunn cleared the way. He generously provided \$5,000 a month for KUAC (pronounced "Quack" by

its opponents) from his contingency fund. The sum is greater than that received by all other committees of the state legislature combined.

The first KUAC hearings were held this summer in Frankfort and concerned the riot which erupted in Louisville during the spring. Only so-called friendly witnesses testified. The consequence of selective testimony was to blame the riots not on poverty and racist conditions that produced them but on certain outside agitators and on Carl Braden, the executive director of SCEF. KUAC next met in October, this time to investigate un-American activities in Pikeville. The investigation was formally requested by Robert Holcomb, two students at Pikeville College who thought the college administration had become too liberal, and two residents of Marrowbone Creek, the area of Pike County where anti-poverty workers had concentrated their efforts.

The AVs, SCEF workers, and a group of students from Pikeville College, who called themselves Kentucky Students Serving Kentucky (KSSK), were no longer working on strip mining. The central issue this fall has been a controversial proposed water district grant of \$1,800,000 and a \$270,000 loan—all from the federal government. Pure water is also a potent issue in Pike County for, according to a local grand jury report, 80 per cent of the wells are polluted. The AVs and the Pike County Citizens Association (PCCA), a group of poor people, contend that poor people cannot afford the \$25-per-household fee required to hook into the proposed water system. They have suggested a rate schedule based on income in which those below the \$3,000-a-year poverty line would not have to pay. The AVs and PCCA organized poor people to support their proposal. The result was that only sixteen of the required 700 signatures were obtained for the petition indicating that those signing were prepared to pay the fee for water service.

Pikeville Chamber of Commerce President Holcomb, proud of Pikeville's designation last year as an "All-American City, said KUAC's hearings prove that the AVs were trying to "sabotage" the water district money. He went on to say that the director of the Pike County AVs, Tom Ramsey, "wanted to control the money we would get from the government." Ramsey has a different view. He contends that the water district is not designed to benefit the poor—who suffer most from the polluted well water. "The basic underlying motive of the whole business" is to "turn Pike County into a tourist center"—which will hardly benefit those people isolated in the hollers:

Although no AVs testified at the Pikeville hearings on this matter, KUAC issued an interim report on November 29 on the evidence it had heard. It recommended in the strongest possible language that the Governor see to it that the AVs be permanently discontinued. It said that the AVs had been excessively funded and a "tremendous detriment to the deserving people of this region." The report concluded that the AVs "work apparently to create strife, rather than . . . to better conditions in the area itself." When questioned by a reporter, during the news conference announcing the report, as to whether or not KUAC discovered any un-American activities in Pike County, Chairman Scott Miller (R., Louisville) hedgingly concluded that "working against the health of the people was un-American." He said the question of communism will await future hearings.

The second series of hearings in Pikeville were held on December 3 and 4. One AV staff member, Mrs. Easterling, did testify this time. In a moment of tension and silence she opened her remarks to the committee with an apology. Bystanders in the packed courtroom moved to the edge of their seats

in anticipation of her exposing communism among the AVs. In strong and unequivocal language she apologized to the people of Pike County for having helped elect that "dirty courthouse bunch" headed by Ratiiff.

Tension was further stirred when she complained to KUAC that her life had been threatened because of her work with the AVs. When one of the committee members asked what threats she had received, she replied that she had received threatening telephone calls and that windows of her home had been shot out. "I don't call that threats," scoffed Charles Upton, the KUAC member. Louisville's *Courier Journal* aptly replied in an editorial the next day that had Upton been in her position he would not likely confuse such gestures "with a visit from the Welcome Wagon." Approval by the Governor is needed for the AVs to continue to receive OEO funds. That decision must be made before the first of the year.

Redbaiting, riot-baiting, charges of sedition, the collusion of local, state and federal officials, TVA's support of strip mining—this is no war on poverty. In eastern Kentucky, it is a war on poverty workers, especially those who see poverty as basically a political matter. In the early morning of December 13, a bomb was thrown at the McSurely house from a passing car; no one was hurt. The following Monday they made a formal request for investigation by the U.S. District Attorney, but Alan McSurely says: "Nothing will come of it because the people who run this country don't give a damn about the poor people." The local power structure and the anti-poverty workers could hardly be further apart. Mrs. Easterling emphasized that "some of the people up in the mountains are so scared of the courthouse gang in Pikeville that they haven't been out of their hollers to go to town for twenty years. Most of them are disabled miners with the black lung and are afraid someone will take their checks." Holcomb views the overall picture quite differently: "There really aren't any big conflicts in Pike County. If you measure the people's actual physical needs, there isn't much poverty either."

FACTFINDING MISSION

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note from an article in the *Wall Street Journal* of June 16 that the members of the President's factfinding mission to Southeast Asia had relatively little difficulty in finding the facts. To a great extent this is because the facts had already been decided upon before the committee left Washington.

Peter R. Kann, in his article entitled "In Indochina, Factfinding at a Frenetic Pace," has outlined the 4-day itinerary of the VIP's who were entrusted with this onerous and difficult task. For instance, Kann reports:

The VIP's inspected three armies (American, Vietnamese, Cambodian) in the course of a single day.

We can see in this episode a very interesting and useful method to drastically cut the amount of time that factfinding committees usually take before we have the benefit of their considered opinions. President Nixon has presented us with a solution which is as simple as

it is novel—if you determine the conclusions to be reached by a committee and arrange a speedy exhibition of the facts which support those conclusions, you preclude the need for long deliberations, and the committee can provide you with the answers you want.

I find it difficult to understand why the committee had to leave Washington to report on its findings. I would also suggest to the President that the next time he might find an echo chamber more suited to his purposes.

The article follows:

IN INDOCHINA, FACTFINDING AT A FRENETIC PACE

(By Peter R. Kann)

SAIGON.—President Nixon's fact finding mission of Senators, governors, Congressmen and White House staffers returned to Washington recently after a four-day whirlwind tour of South Vietnam and allied-occupied bases in Cambodia. The group returned some optimistic conclusions to the President (with one dissenting opinion) but to a reporter who went along, the tour only confirmed a more basic impression: If facts, like captured documents and Communist corpses, are in abundant supply here, understanding is more elusive.

This VIP visit, like the many that have preceded it, had something of a "see Europe in seven days" quality about it. The VIPs inspected three armies (American, Vietnamese, Cambodian) in the course of a single day. They were briefed on Vietnamization, Cambodianization, military successes, pacification gains and political progress.

The group consisted of Senators John G. Tower, Howard M. Cannon, Thomas J. McIntyre, and George Murphy; Representatives Marvin Price, O. C. Fisher, G. William Whitehurst, and William Bray; governors Raymond Shafer, Robert McNair, and John Love; and White House staffers Bryce Harlow and Herbert Klein.

The Congressional delegates are all members of Senate and House Armed Services Committees and, with the notable exception of Sen. McIntyre, are Administration supporters on the war issue.

(At Shakey's Hill, an American fire support base on a muddy hilltop ten miles inside Cambodia, a young U.S. Army lieutenant looked over the names of the VIPs and commented: "Kind of looks like the President has preprogrammed his feedback.")

SIRENS AND FLASHING LIGHTS

On their first of two days in the field the VIPs, outfitted in spanking new Army fatigues, visited the Mekong Delta south of Saigon to study Vietnamization and pacification. After a round of briefings at a Delta airbase, the VIP cavalcade—replete with screaming sirens and flashing red lights—roared through the squalid shantytown suburbs of Can Tho to a chieu hoi (defector) center where former Vietcong were lined up to give them three well orchestrated cheers.

The group then helicoptered to Huu Thanh village in Vinh Long province, a community destroyed during the 1968 Tet offensive, insecure for more than a year afterward, but recently pacified and rebuilt. Briefers several times told the VIPs that the village had been "100% destroyed by the VC." Local Vietnamese officials and American advisors noted privately that at least half the village had been destroyed by American airstrikes.

The local officials, however, agreed with the briefers that the military security and increasing prosperity of the pacified village were very real. "It's a showplace but there are others like it," said a local adviser.

At the forward headquarters of Delta Commander General Ngo Dzu the VIPs inspected neatly arranged mountains of captured weap-

ons and were briefed—with the aid of flipcharts, colored map overlays and simultaneous translation—on ARVN exploits in Cambodia.

General Dzu assaulted one of the hills of captured weapons and plucked a Communist rifle for presentation to President Nixon. Mr. Harlow of the White House staff gave the General a Nixon tieclip in exchange.

The delegation later helicoptered into Cambodia, landing in a grass clearing on the outskirts of the Cambodian provincial capital of Kampong Trach. With General Dzu in the lead the VIPs reviewed ragtag elements of a Cambodian brigade.

Cambodian officials, including the provincial governor, were present in the clearing and indeed had prepared their own modest briefing, featuring a "liste des besoins" (list of needs) which, by circumstantial evidence, would be extensive. General Dzu never got around to asking the Cambodians to give their briefing. But the Cambodian brigade commander later was invited to drink one of the coconuts he had provided for the VIPs.

The visitors' second day in the field was heavily devoted to briefings and weapons displays, but also included a visit to Shakey's Hill. The hill was first occupied by elements of the First Calvary Division Airmobile, and is named for an Air Cav soldier who died in the assault. The hill was laced with Communist weapons storage bunkers.

The crest of the hill, now occupied by elements of the Ninth Division, was a foot deep in reddish brown mud. The GIs were living in poncho-covered foxholes far more primitive than those holes which housed enemy supplies. Vietcong were operating a few kilometers away and American patrols had been making what briefers call "light contact"—one or two GIs dead or wounded every few days.

It seemed like a very typical fire support base—except for a few special preparations being made for the VIPs. Half an hour before the visitors arrived, combat troops were kneeling in the mud taping little VIP name tags on the backs of metal folding chairs which had been flown in for the occasion. Other GIs were putting finishing touches on an expanded latrine. And others were arranging a table of cake and cold drinks, also specially flown in by chopper. The GIs operating out of this base had mostly been living off C-rations.

Such preparations might have been obvious to perceptive VIPs. Others might not. The VIPs were not aware, for instance, that prior to their arrival Army barbers had arrived by helicopter to trim the GIs' hair and shave off their beards. This was an unpopular move. "Man, they shaved off my beard this morning. Now why they have to go and do that? I mean how is shaving off my beard gonna win this war?" says one of a group of GIs sitting on some sandbags awaiting the VIPs.

The men's fatigues are cleaner than might be expected given the surroundings. The GIs explain that clean fatigues had been flown in earlier that morning. "I ain't had a set of clean fatigues in over a month. They probably going to take these back soon as the Senators leave," says a GI whose fatigue insignia say he is Alvarez of the First Division. He explains that he is not Alvarez and that he's in the Ninth Division. "I don't know where they got these fatigues," adds the man labeled Alvarez.

The men have a lot of gripes. They say they were moved into this area of jungled hills from their normal operating area in the flat and open Mekong Delta and that they aren't trained to fight in this terrain.

The men say they were told on May 2 that they were going off on a three day operation; they haven't been back to their base since. "Morale is bad man, we're dragging," says one of a group of ten GIs. Others agree. "We are bushed and we're scared," says another.

Why don't they tell their gripes to the

VIPs? "Higher up said we'd get article fifteen if we just walk up to those Senators and start saying something. They said we got to go through channels," explains one of the GIs.

MORALE IS "EXCEPTIONAL"

The VIP party arrives in a bevy of choppers. They are led to the briefing tent where they are told about the battle to occupy the hill and about the discovery of enemy arms caches. Questions are invited and Mr. Klein of the White House staff asks about the morale of the GIs. "Exceptional," says the colonel giving the briefing. The VIPs are then presented with captured Communist belts which, they discover, were made for Vietnamese size waists.

The visitors view captured weapons and exchange pleasantries with GI constituents who have been lined up behind little signs bearing the names of states the Senators and Congressmen represent.

An hour later in a forward brigade command post camp on the Vietnam side of the border, at least one Congressman, Mr. Whitehurst of Virginia, gets more than polite conversation from a GI lunch companion. "You get so tired humping in the mud, stuff on your back, they don't give you no rest, no it ain't right out there in the boonies at all," says PFC King Wright.

The VIPs see more captured Communist supplies, including some used bottles of blood plasma and bandages, and get a briefing in which Major General Edward Bautz Jr., commander of the 25th Division, announces that "we got part of COSVN headquarters."

One wonders whether COSVN (Communist Central Office for South Vietnam) has its own VIP visitors to contend with.

SOCIAL SECURITY VERSUS UNIVERSAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 18, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Robert J. Myers, F.S.A., until recently Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, has been trying to alert the American people and their leaders of the undermining of the social security system by those socialists who advocate equal Federal benefits to provide full economic security, including health care for almost everyone.

Because of the seriousness of the "Fedicare" conspiracy and the fact that the recent Social Security amendments passed by the House delegated additional powers to the Secretary of HEW, I include an article from Medical Economics, along with an article and speech by Mr. Myers, and a newsclipping from the local paper at this point:

[From Medical Economics, Jan. 5, 1970]

AN INSIDE VIEW OF THE GREAT FEDICARE CONSPIRACY

(By Ralph M. Thurlow)

When former H.E.W. Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen refused to increase the beneficiaries' contribution to the medical insurance part of Medicare, he raised the lid on a long smoldering feud. The feud, according to Social Security chief actuary Robert J. Myers, pits the "expansionists" against the "moderates" over the question of how extensive Social Security benefits should be: Specifically, Myers

charges that Cohen's decision to maintain the then \$4 contribution was one more expansionist effort to provide benefits "without making the increasing cost of those benefits readily apparent to the public." It was just the sort of move an expansionist would make, Myers says, to turn Medicare into the keystone of a system of nationalized health care.

"The Nixon Administration's decision to raise the contribution is a forthright recognition of the Social Security law's intent," Myers contends. He believes the efforts of the expansionists have been on the increase and that this may now seriously affect the program.

Who are these expansionists, what do they want, and how are they trying to get it? These are the questions this magazine put to Myers after he spoke on the subject at a recent symposium. Myers' answers add up to describe what might be called a great Fedicare conspiracy—one that could, if successful, dramatically change the way medical care is delivered in this country.

Expansionists, Myers says, are those in or out of Government who believe that Social Security should provide full economic security, including medical care, for about 95 per cent of the American people. Myers puts himself among the moderates. He contends that they believe the present system is reasonably adequate, needs only some updating, and should be no more than a floor under economic and health needs—leaving plenty of room for private enterprise in those areas.

In addition to former Secretary Cohen, Myers puts Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball, Walter P. Reuther, and many others in the expansionist camp. Their goals are attractive to a great many people, he maintains, if only because their overall intentions are concealed in a strategy that calls for piecemeal adoption of programs. "The ink is scarcely dry on a newly enacted amendment," Myers says, "before plans are already being developed for the next legislative effort."

Some idea of how the expansionists work, Myers claims, can be seen in their pursuit of higher Social Security cash-benefit objectives. They would nearly double the current maximum earnings base of \$7,800, to \$15,000 in 1970, instead of accepting the base the moderates are now proposing—\$9,000 in 1972. If \$15,000 were made the new base, according to Myers, the next step of the expansionists would be to work for increasing the Social Security payments to retirees and others by 50 per cent, then to twice the present level.

Such an increase, he believes, would make it unnecessary to have private pension plans and other forms of long-term private savings. Most people would be covered by the \$15,000 base at a benefit level that would support them more than adequately. The result: a greatly diminished flow of money into private savings and pension plans that would drive private industry to the Federal Government for its investment capital. And that would be nothing compared to the effect the expansionists would have on medical care, according to Myers. Here's how he describes it:

Taking the gradual approach to their ultimate goal of Fedicare for everybody, the expansionists would first propose Kiddicare—prenatal, obstetrical, and infant care up to whatever age the lobby could obtain at the moment. The Kiddicare program would not only miss the basic problem of the environmental factor in infant mortality, but it would also reduce considerably the scope of private insurance. With fewer subscribers, the cost of private insurance would escalate, and critics would suggest that the Government program take over the entire load.

The same process could be applied to other areas of health care, and the resulting complete and comprehensive national insurance system would, says Myers, have a drastic

effect. As Medicare now stands, it's possible to have private reimbursement standards against which program reimbursement bases can be measured. Under a complete coverage program, there would be no private-sector standard against which to measure the usual-and-customary charges of physicians. Accordingly, Myers claims, fees could be established only by agreement between the Government and the doctor, and the practice of medicine as it's known today would cease to exist.

"There's a very high likelihood then," Myers says, "that the Government, if it started to establish fees, would go on to establish capitation costs, and after that to put all doctors on salary. Following that, it could be argued logically by expansionists that the Government should also control the supply of physicians, and that would entail their education as well." The insidious thing about expansionist thinking, according to Myers, is that it has worthwhile goals; the trouble is that enormous Government programs are the only way expansionists see of achieving those goals.

Medicare, which operates well as a floor under the medical costs of the aged, he says, would have luxury carpeting over it, then walls and a ceiling, until it became a structure in itself, if the expansionists took over. What's the best way to avoid such a takeover? To Myers the answers are health insurance programs to which the public contributes, so people can see what their benefits are really costing them, and private medical care that gets the job done.

[From the Reader's Digest, April 1970]

SOCIAL SECURITY AT THE CROSSROADS

(By Robert J. Myers)

For the last 35 years it has been my job to provide federal policymakers, administrators and Congress with the cost forecasts essential to keeping the nation's Social Security program on a sound financial course. The assignment is above politics. However, in view of my experience with Social Security, I believe it is my duty to warn that powerful pressures are now building up, both within and outside our government, that could soon steer Social Security down a dangerously unsound financial course.

These pressures come from a wide range of people, from social planners to politicians, who are all too willing to boost retirement benefits without letting the public in on the economic consequences. They include, among others, some of my own associates in the Social Security Administration, certain Congressmen, theoreticians from the academic community, labor leaders, and lobbyists who parade as independent spokesmen for organized senior citizens. For example:

A State University of New York sociologist, Joseph H. Bunzel, tells the House Ways and Means Committee that the present minimum monthly payment should be quadrupled and that the taxable wage base should be rocketed from \$7,800 to \$100,000 a year.

Congress has before it a maze of proposals for vast new Social Security benefits. Many Congressmen want to provide the wherewithal by tapping general federal revenues—your tax dollars. One such advocate, Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D., N.Y.), calls for "financing the Social Security system through whatever general revenues are needed to keep it actuarially solvent."

Speaking for 22 private welfare organizations, Philip Bernstein urges a broad and costly new pattern of benefit increases to be paid for "by the total community rather than by payroll taxes."

Former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey has called for a 50-percent increase in Social Security payouts, a plea echoed by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen.

Undoubtedly, these are sincere men. But they are united in promoting the delusion

that we can forever expand the Social Security balloon—yet never fear that it will explode in our faces.

Thus, our Social Security system has come to a crossroads: Do we stay on the main, moderate road we have followed up to now? Or do we take the "high road" advocated by the expansionists (a tempting road, in an election year, for some politicians of both parties)?

Before answering, it might be wise to consider what Social Security originally set out to accomplish.

Floor of Protection. Unlike private insurance, which pays off from the investment of your premiums, Social Security chiefly transfers to non-working beneficiaries a tax collected on the payrolls of the nation's workers. These workers contribute in the reasonable expectation that there will be younger workers willing to do the same for them in years to come. Moderate legislators, who have sought to safeguard development of the system, have worked to limit Social Security to what initially was called a "basic floor of protection." This meant keeping costs low enough to encourage development of private savings and investment, while at the same time assuring Social Security benefits which, when combined with these other anticipated resources, would be high enough to enable most Americans to maintain at least an acceptable minimum standard of living on retiring or becoming permanently disabled.

The private investments that have resulted from this moderate approach speak for themselves. Individual Americans now own about 34 million homes, compared with 12 million 40 years ago. In that same period, their life insurance in force has climbed from \$102 billion to \$1300 billion; personal savings from \$3 billion to more than \$40 billion a year. The number of people with private hospital insurance has increased from just 12 million in 1940 to 170 million now. Today about 29 million individuals are protected by \$125 billion invested in private pension and deferred profit-sharing plans. Only about seven percent of all our 25 million Social Security beneficiaries now require an additional check from public-welfare funds in order to meet their basic needs. Surely any Social Security setup that can accomplish this must be regarded as generally adequate.

Through the years this basic floor-of-protection concept has permitted benefit rises to keep up-to-date with economic changes. It has also permitted inequities to be ironed out and refinements to be made. This process should continue. For example, in an era of skilled-labor shortage there is certainly room for re-examination of that portion of the law which curtails or completely shuts off a man's Social Security benefits if he wants to continue working after his 65th birthday—and then requires him to continue to pay Social Security taxes. President Nixon has proposed certain improvements in this area.

Conflict of Philosophies. However, simple adjustments to keep the basic system up-to-date are not at all what the expansionists have in mind. The AFL-CIO, a prime source of expansion pressure, candidly states that between the moderates and the expansionists "the conflict is not a simple battle of numbers; it is a conflict of philosophies." In place of a basic floor of protection, the AFL-CIO argues that the Social Security system alone "should provide the basic retirement system by which the elderly can live out their lives in dignity and economic security."

In the past, Congress has held the expansionists in check, and thus kept the system actuarially sound. But by last year the expansionists were able to get the Senate to adopt, by a 48 to 41 vote, a so-called "Christmas tree" measure that nearly doubled the minimum Social Security payment—and jumped the taxable wage base from \$7800 to \$12,000. Only through compromise were

the House-Senate conferees on this legislation, under the leadership of House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and his senior Republican associate, Rep. John W. Byrnes, able to slice away at some of the Senate innovations and send to the White House a bill which, for the time being, held the expansionists to a 15-percent across-the-board increase in current Social Security benefits.

Even so, this one piece of "emergency" legislation will necessitate \$4.2 billion of additional outlays for 1970 alone. Over the years, this change will use up the actuarial surplus of the Social Security trust fund: that is, all of the taxes collected through the years that are in excess of required disbursements. President Nixon had intended that this surplus not only should finance his proposal for a ten-percent hike in benefits (which would have adequately offset increased living costs to date), but also should pay for his other proposed improvements: a better deal for people over 65 who want to continue working; equitable increases in widow's pensions; a temporary reduction in the Social Security tax rate that workers must pay; rescuing Medicare from a financial dilemma.

TORCH OF PROMISE

What now? Congress must reopen the entire Social Security package and find ways to bring in more money. President Nixon has already called for raising the taxable wage base to \$9000 in 1971, 12 months earlier than he had previously recommended. But even this will not be enough to sufficiently bolster Medicare's seriously underfinanced hospital insurance—which at present levels of financing will go broke by late 1972.

Crisis or no crisis, however, the expansionists are back again at the Capitol, pulling and shoving to promote enormously expensive new schemes. No fewer than 892 bills to change Social Security were dropped into the House legislative hopper during the first session of this Congress. Many of these proposals would so balloon benefits that taxes would also have to soar. But one bill stands out as the expansionists' torch of promise. It was introduced by Rep. Jacob H. Gilbert of New York, and is backed by the National Council of Senior Citizens,¹ which has kept up an incessant clamor for ever larger Social Security payments as essential to combat what it considers to be "destitution." In fact, this nationwide lobby organization has boasted that Representative Gilbert "consulted with officers of the National Council in designing every feature of the bill."

If the Gilbert bill were to pass (which is highly unlikely), it would all by itself raise last year's Social Security benefits by about 50 percent. The minimum of \$120 a month would go to many individuals who weren't part of the regular labor force but, as in the case of some wives and retired government employees (who are not covered by Social Security), have accepted temporary part-time jobs just to qualify for a minimum benefit. A retired couple who under last year's law could collect a maximum of \$376 a month would take in as much as \$805 instead; for a widow with one child the increase would be from \$307 to \$805. Doctors' calls and drugs from the neighborhood pharmacy would be largely free to all retirees; there would be no restraining premiums to pay.

All this is just the beginning. The ultimate aim of the expansionists, as disclosed by Walter P. Reuther, cochairman of the powerful Alliance for Labor Action, includes a Social

¹ The National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., bills itself as a "nonpartisan" group dedicated only to promoting the cause of the nation's elderly. In fact, it has been financed in part by the Democratic National Committee and the AFL-CIO.

Security annuity of as much as \$10,000 a year, amounting to a full two thirds of a beneficiary's highest ten years of "covered" pre-retirement earnings.

What is astounding is that so little is said about the cost of this sort of expansion. The fact is that every additional benefit that is handed out to 25 million retirees must be paid for by taxing the 73 million persons who do work, along with their employers. By the end of the current decade, for example, the cost to the taxpayers for providing the benefits called for by the Gilbert bill would mount to about \$135 billion a year. The taxable base would increase to \$15,000 in 1972 and probably to about \$20,400 by 1980. Direct Social Security taxes would be increased from a top of \$920 a year now scheduled for 1987 to as much as \$2448 by 1980, shared equally between employe and employer. (Self-employed persons would pay \$1632 by 1980.) Even these colossal taxes would fall one-third—or \$45 billion—short of paying the annual bill. Where, pray, would this additional cash come from?

The Greatest Dangers. Commissioner of Social Security Robert M. Ball has raised the question of "whether some of the additional financing should come from general revenues." This means that after you pay as high a Social Security tax as can be directly squeezed out of you, you'll have to hand over even bigger federal income and other taxes so as to provide a Social Security subsidy—a subsidy that will be as difficult to control as any other that finds its way into the federal bureaucracy.

And give heed to this. The march of these expansionists will not be halted simply by non-adoption of the current Gilbert bill or by failure of any other single piece of legislation. Their long-range strategy is to lay down a barrage of demands, win what they can through compromise, then, even before the ink is dry on the legislation, begin anew the advance which brings them ever closer to their goals.

What makes all this so important just now is that our Social Security system has virtually matured: that is, there is a good balance as between costs levied on the economy and the resulting benefits. Thus, we've arrived at a cross-roads for Social Security. It would seem a good time to heed the advice of the late Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis:

"Experience should teach us," he said, "to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."

UNIVERSAL HEALTH INSURANCE

(A Speech Presented by Robert J. Myers, F.S.A., Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration, to the Annual Convention of the Oklahoma State Medical Association, May 16, 1970)

(NOTE.—The views expressed here are those of the speaker and not necessarily those of the Social Security Administration.)

The motto of the actuarial profession is, in brief, "To substitute facts for impressions". In appearing before this Convention on such an important and complex subject as national health insurance and Medicare, I would certainly want to stay with the facts of the matter and not to bring in impressions and emotions, as do so many persons when they get into these areas.

To start off with, I would disavow any claim to being a complete expert on all aspects of this subject. Rather, my experience has only been in the financing aspects. And most certainly, financing, although important, is by no means of primary importance, but rather the actual provision of medical care is paramount, and in that area you, my audience, have far more expertise. In fact, I

believe that this is the great weakness of many of the advocates of national health insurance—namely, that they do not have a real knowledge of many of the complex elements that go into providing high-quality medical care, much as they might claim that they do.

Before going any further, let me define what I believe the term "national health insurance" means, since nowadays many people are using it with quite different meanings. In my opinion, national health insurance means a program under which the entire population of the country, or virtually the entire population, would be provided all their medical care needs either directly by the Government through salaried physicians and other staff and through government-owned hospitals (socialized medicine), or else through private providers of service most of whose remuneration would come from government insurance programs (the Medicare or social insurance approach).

Other types of proposals are currently being made that are called national health insurance plans, but, in my opinion, they should be categorized differently. Some proposals would completely change—or it might be said, scrap—present methods of providing medical care. It would seem to many people that these would be catastrophic in effect if put into operation in the near future, and I think that many of the advocates realize this but are merely using the proposals for talking purposes. Other proposals would instead be harmonious with the present medical-care system, which, despite strident charges from some quarters, has not been remaining static but rather, in the desirable pattern of American democracy, has been gradually and steadily developing better and more efficient procedures as experience has indicated feasible.

The social insurance approach is taken in bills introduced by Senator Javits and Congresswoman Griffiths. Both bills are truly national health insurance, since they would apply to virtually the entire population and would provide virtually complete medical care, with the financing being through payroll taxes on workers and employers, plus a substantial matching government subsidy. The latter, of course, merely tends to hide some of the huge costs involved, since who else but workers and employers will provide the money for the general-revenues financing?

Within a few years, after the full range of comprehensive benefits are provided, the cost of these plans will be at least 10% of payroll, regardless of how it is divided up, and could well be as high as 15%. Actually, no precise cost estimates are possible—as they can be made for a cash-benefits program—because there are so many intangibles involved. For instance, there could be no certainty in the cost estimating process as to how the remuneration of physicians will be determined once there is a monopolistic, monolithic health insurance program. Nor is there any way to know how much services will be provided in such areas as hospitalization and drugs once the financial restrictions on patients have been largely removed.

At the one extreme, a national health insurance system can have a low cost by fiat of the Government if it merely allots a certain amount of money for health services and provides only what results therefrom—which has been very much the case under the British National Health Service. On the other hand, the financial sky would be the limit if a national health insurance plan provides all the services that people demand as readily and quickly available as possibly can be, without regard to whether this is medically necessary or desirable.

A quite different approach has been taken by Governor Rockefeller. He advocates, in es-

sence, that employers must have insurance or other programs covering certain basic health needs of their employees and their families, with a separate governmentally-financed program of similar nature for non-employed persons. In many ways, this would change the existing system very little, since the vast majority of employees in the country already have reasonably adequate private health insurance.

Another type of proposal is to grant tax credits for those who purchase, on a voluntary basis, comprehensive health insurance coverage from private insurers. The amount of the tax credit would be inversely related to family income, so that the very low income groups would receive their insurance policies without cost to them. Then, there would be a gradual tapering off for higher incomes, until, after a certain point, there would be no government subsidy involved. Such proposals would, of course, be financed from general revenues and would therefore mean higher taxes from one source or another for the general taxpayer. Proposals along these lines have been made by the AMA and by Congressman Fulton and Senator Fannin.

A quite different approach has been suggested by Congressman Durward Hall. One part of his proposal would be to provide private health insurance policies for the medically indigent and thus would replace the Medicaid program. The second part of his proposal would cover truly catastrophic illness for the entire population, defining "catastrophic" in relation to the family's income. Through the latter procedure, families would obtain the very necessary economic protection in those rare instances where medical costs run far in excess of the maximum limits in most health insurance policies. The cost for this "catastrophic expense" plan would be met from general revenues, which seems a most desirable approach because of the relatively few cases involved—so that establishing any insurance system involving premium payments would be administratively inefficient.

One might well wonder why there is currently such a clamor for national health insurance or similar programs at this moment. Medical science has been making giant steps of progress, and the health and longevity of the American public is at an all-time high. Many different types of programs are being developed and put into effect to provide adequate health care for the very small minority of our population who are truly in poverty. And yet the advocates of socialized medicine are raising their voices ever louder to denigrate the existing medical situation. In turn, this causes more moderate groups to examine the situation and to come up with alternative proposals of their own. Undoubtedly, this debate in our democratic society has certain advantages, but it does seem somewhat strange that it is now occurring.

I think that there is a rather simple explanation of this occurrence—namely, the general inflation that we have been having for the last five years. As you well know, the price level has been rising at an annual rate of about 5%, while at the same time the general level of earning has been rising about 7% to 8% per year. At the same time, physician fees have also been rising at about 7% to 8% per year, while hospital costs have been increasing about 15% annually. The much sharper rise in medical costs than in the general price level has been brought home strongly to the American public. For one thing, there is the natural tendency that people object most strongly to rising prices for things that do not give them immediate personal pleasure—and most medical costs hardly fall in that category, even though over the long run they are primary in achieving personal enjoyment and satisfaction of living.

The advocates of socialized medicine have

seized this particular opportunity to achieve their goals or advance toward them, since they believe that the public can be aroused by the sizable increases in medical-care costs. These advocates made a strong drive for national health insurance—preferably of the socialized medicine type—in the 1940's, but they failed to achieve their goal because of the general growth of private health insurance then (which they said could never achieve the success that it actually has).

After laying low for two decades, during which they sought to get the camel's nose in the tent through the enactment of Medicare, these advocates of socialized medicine are again out in the open in full force, using as their appealing argument the recent large increases in medical-care costs. As propagandists, they are quite willing to ignore and leave unmentioned several significant and crucial facts.

First, the largest increases in medical care costs have been for hospitalization—an area that is considered sacrosanct, because 95% of the short-stay hospital beds are in "non-profit" institutions. Second, the relative trend of physician fees in the past five years has been almost exactly the same as it was in the preceding two decades—namely, increasing at about the same rate as the general earnings level.

Third, the illusion is fostered that, somehow or other, insurance is magic and has the inevitable effect of reducing costs. Actually, insurance does not reduce costs in the aggregate, but rather merely, although desirably, it spreads the costs among the insured group. Thus, none have extremely high costs, while others have little or no cost at all, but rather all persons have a uniform low or moderate cost (i.e. the premium rate).

In summary, on this point, it seems to me that the advocates of socialized medicine are trying to deceive the general public and sell them their old line of goods under a new guise—sharply rising medical costs which are unfairly blamed on physicians, when instead they are much more due to the rising general price and wage level and to the trend of hospital costs.

Now, let me turn to a subject on which I believe that I have considerably more expertise—namely, the financial status of the Medicare program, about which there has been much public misunderstanding. As you know, the Hospital Insurance program is financed predominantly by payroll taxes paid by and with respect to employed persons, whereas the Supplementary Medical Insurance program is financed by premiums from the enrollees and matching government payments.

The cost-estimating problems have been much greater for the HI program than for SMI. Under HI, the attempt is made to provide adequate financing over a 25-year period by establishing a proper schedule of contribution rates. On the other hand, under SMI, the premium rate is determined for only a short advance period, now annually.

The cost of the HI program over the next 25 years as now estimated is somewhat more than twice as high as the original estimate made in 1965, when the legislation was enacted. To say the least, this is a very professionally embarrassing situation. My actuarial colleagues in the private insurance sector in 1965 believed that my estimates were too low, but even their higher estimates are now only about half of what the cost apparently will be over the next 25 years.

What are the reasons that this very significant discrepancy occurred? The primary reason is the rapid and completely unexpected escalation of hospitalization costs that occurred in the past and that is quite likely to continue for at least a few more years in the future. Before 1965, hospitalization costs had been increasing about 7%

annually, and there seemed some indication that this rate would soon taper off. Instead, with the war in Viet Nam and the accompanying economic effects and, to some extent, with the introduction of the Medicare and Medicaid programs, hospitalization costs since 1965 have jumped by 15% annually. To the best of my knowledge, nobody in 1965 made any prediction that this could possibly happen.

The other factor—and a much less significant one—is the extent of hospital utilization. I had initially estimated utilization of about 3.2 days per person per year. And my insurance colleagues had estimated somewhat higher. But both of us were well below the current experience of about 4.0 days per person per year. My current cost estimates not only use this figure as a starting point, but they also allow for a small increase in hospital utilization each year for about the next decade.

Now turning to the SMI program, my actuarial cost estimates have been much closer to the mark. Once again, this is a point of evidence that contradicts the claim that physicians are largely, or even entirely, responsible for the costs of the Medicare program being much higher than anticipated! Specifically, the SMI premium rate is, by law, supposed to be determined so as to finance adequately the benefits and administrative expenses on an accrual basis. By the latter term is meant that the costs incurred in a certain period, even though payment therefor is made subsequently in some cases, is to be matched up against the income from premiums and government contributions for that period.

As the actual experience developed, the initial premium rate of \$3.00 was too low, but only by about 7%. Although technically speaking, it might be said that this made the program financially insolvent, nonetheless it could continue to operate on a cash basis because of the inherent lag between the time when medical services are rendered and when the program makes payments therefor.

The premium rate was then changed to \$4.00, in part because some new benefits were provided, in part to recognize that the initial rate had been too low, and in part to make allowance for likely future increases in physician fees and other costs covered by the program and in utilization of services by the enrollees. Once again, after the experience had developed and had been analyzed, it was found that the premium rate had been promulgated at too low a level—again by about 7%. Part of this small discrepancy was due to an influence epidemic and part was due to somewhat higher increases in fees than had been estimated. Still, the system was able to function on a cash basis for the reasons indicated previously, and there was a trust fund balance of several hundred million dollars.

Then, it became necessary in December 1968 to promulgate yet another premium rate, this time for the year beginning July 1969. Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen, who was to go out of office in a few weeks as a result of the election of President Nixon, had the legal authority to promulgate the premium rate at any amount which he determined, but the Congressional intent was that such rate should be based on actuarial analysis and computations. Nonetheless, Secretary Cohen ignored the actuarial recommendation of a rate of at least \$4.40 and instead continued it at \$4.00.

He took this action on the grounds that he would, in essence, freeze physician fees (but not other costs under the program) at the existing level—even though he would not be around to see that this was done! Moreover, he had the temerity to say that he was taking this action to help President Nixon, since this would mean less cost to the

General Treasury for the matching contributions! Of course, what he did not say was that his action would virtually bankrupt the SMI Trust Fund—as it has actually done—and would therefore cause his successor greater embarrassment by forcing him to promulgate a much higher premium rate the next time.

And all this has actually occurred. The balance in the SMI Trust Fund at the end of next month will probably be only about \$50 million, or the equivalent of only about one week's outgo. Secretary Finch found it necessary last December to promulgate the new premium rate, beginning in July, at \$5.30 per month, and he forthrightly followed the actuarial recommendation despite the widespread political criticism it evoked.

Now let me turn briefly to the matter of the freezing of physician fees in the past. Let us also consider current proposals for the future, as the Nixon Administration has recommended and as the House Ways and Means Committee has adopted in a bill that it has recently reported out.

I do not claim to have the answer as to whether physician remuneration is too high or too low, but I am convinced that the recent trend in physician fees is entirely justifiable in relation to other prices and to salary levels in general. The justifications made by former Secretary Cohen for freezing physician fees for Medicare purposes do not seem to me to be in accordance with the intent of the law.

When Medicare was enacted, the principle was that reimbursement would be made on a reasonable-charges basis, as determined by the physician's customary charges to all the patients and by the prevailing level of physician charges in the locality. With respect to the latter element, I believe that there was the misconception that, in a given area, the vast majority of the physicians had about the same general charge structure and that only a few "society" physicians had much higher fees.

Assuming this to be the case—and I believe that, in actual practice, it is really not so—then the intent of considering prevailing charges was to reduce only the few instances of much-higher-than-average charges. In fact, the underlying intent of the legislation in this respect was that the SMI program should consider physician charges in the same manner as was, and still is, done by the large group insurance companies, who take a very flexible view of the situation and only reduce charges for reimbursement purposes when there are obviously excessive charges or fraudulent ones.

Instead, the administrative operation of the SMI program was established on a quite different basis, with painstaking and costly procedures devised so as to examine closely all charges. In my opinion, this advance planning was done solely for the eventual control of physician fees on a very stringent and different basis than was originally envisioned in the law. Some of this rigid control has already come to light, and some people would like to have much more of it in the future. And the apparatus has been constructed to do exactly this! Underlying all of this is a belief on the part of many of my colleagues that physicians now (and in the past as well) have exorbitantly large incomes and that their income should be reduced—or at least held down in the future as prices and other salaries rise. Some of these colleagues are civil-service employees, but incredibly, a few are political appointees of the Johnson Administration who have not been replaced by the Nixon Administration, despite their strong philosophical views favoring the former.

Some very stringent procedures, as well as the supporting "logic", were developed to justify the freeze of physician fees that former

Secretary Cohen imposed and that Secretary Finch has been virtually compelled to continue. Actually, I am not certain that this freeze had any real effect. Like many other economic controls, it may have pushed in the inflationary balloon at one point, only to have it push out in a counteracting manner in another place (such as more utilization or such as charging for some items previously furnished without charge).

One might reasonably think that the term "customary charge" means that the physician is currently charging his patients, just as though he had a sign listing his fees posted in his office. Instead, the peculiar interpretation has been evolved which says, in essence, that a fee is not customary until it has been in effect for about 6 months, and then "custom" cannot change for another year. No such illogical limits prevail in other economic areas—as, for example, utilities being granted an increase in their rates on a certain date because they are economically justified, but then not being allowed to put them into effect for 18 months because of a "customary" provision. In the same way, such artificiality has been introduced in the "prevailing charges" concept, so that there too an 18-month lag is present.

A proposal has currently been made by Secretary Finch that, in the future, the prevailing-charge limits on whatever are determined to be the customary charges of a particular physician shall be the present allowable prevailing charges increased by an index made up partially of changes in the general level of wages and partially of the changes in the general cost level of living. Since the latter usually rises at a lower rate than the former, which rises at about the same rate as physician fees, this would mean that, over the course of time, the prevailing-charges limit would gradually apply completely to each physician, rather than his customary charges. So, there would eventually be a flat fee schedule under SMI for all physicians in a particular locality, determined by the Government. This is quite different from the original approach in the Medicare legislation of paying reasonable charges of physicians.

The physicians of this country have been neatly trapped by the social planners, who secretly envy their high incomes, whether real or only apparent, and thus criticize them on any possible grounds. The intent of the Medicare program was that persons aged 65 and over should pay the same physician fees as younger persons, and thus should not be second-class citizens by being given lower, "charity" rates. Now that the physicians have charged in this manner, they are severely criticized! If they had artificially held down their fees for Medicare patients, then they would have been subject to the danger that the social planners would have pointed out that Medicare was operating very well and at a low cost and that therefore it should be extended to the entire population. You can't win!

The only possible solution to this apparent dilemma would be the development of a feeling of mutual trust and confidence between the Government and the medical profession. This certainly does not exist now—and for good cause. It was quite understandable why this situation did not prevail under the Johnson Administration. It seems almost inexplicable that there has been no change in the current Administration. Perhaps the reason for this is the fact that a number of high-ranking political appointees of the Johnson Administration in the Social Security Administration and in the Public Health Service who develop policy, even though perhaps not finalizing it, have not yet been replaced.

I cannot conclude without saying a few words about the cash-benefits program, Old-

Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance. I deeply believe that this is a very necessary and desirable program and that it is now, and has always been, soundly financed. I believe, as you may know from some of my writings, that there are grave potential dangers ahead because the political liberals, or expansionists, when they get in office again will make strenuous efforts to change the program so that it will no longer be a floor of protection.

Instead, these proponents wish to see the Government provide virtually complete financial security to non-working members of our society through governmental means. In the process, they would destroy almost completely all individual efforts through private savings, private insurance, and private pension plans. I believe that this would have catastrophic effects on people as individuals and, further, that it would have the side effect of greatly weakening or destroying our private enterprise system because of drying up much private investment capital.

The thing to beware of is the introduction of government subsidies into our social insurance systems that are now supported entirely by payroll taxes. Such subsidies give the appearance of being a painless way to expand greatly the benefits of the program, since nobody appears to have his pocketbook tapped therefor, whereas increases in payroll taxes are easily discernible and, accordingly, subject to taxpayer resistance.

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1970]
AMA, BLACK DOCTORS' GROUP JOIN TO SEEK HEALTH INSURANCE
 (By Victor Cohn)

The American Medical Association and the far smaller predominantly black National Medical Association joined forces for the first time yesterday to seek a federally subsidized health insurance program to replace Medicaid.

Before a Senate Finance Subcommittee, they backed a plan much like one President Nixon proposed last week as a substitute for the present Medicaid help for low-income persons.

The President said he will submit a detailed plan in January to either buy health insurance or subsidize it, on a sliding scale, for between 5 and 6 million families with incomes below \$5,620.

Yesterday AMA President Gerald D. Dorman (representing 223,000 doctors) and NMA President Julius W. Hill (representing 6,000) urged:

A federal certificate for every "low income" individual—defined as all who pay \$300 or less in federal income tax—to buy a "qualified and comprehensive" health insurance policy at government expense.

Federal tax credits, on a sliding scale based on their income tax payments, to help the moderate or higher-income buy health plans. As one example, a family of four with

\$6,500 in income and a \$493 federal income tax bill would get a 73 per cent credit toward health insurance.

The AMA has proposed what it calls this "Medicredit" plan in the past. But not until now has it had the backing of the NMA. The NMA long backed fully tax-paid government health insurance for all—on the Medicare principle—and generally has stood well to the left of the conservative AMA.

Yesterday, Dr. Hill, a Los Angeles physician, said the AMA-NMA proposal would work far better than Medicaid in the ghettos.

He strongly defended doctors who care for the poor against accusations that they have been profiteering under Medicare and Medicaid. Restrictions on doctors' fees—recommended in a Finance Subcommittee staff report—would only "make more acute" the ghettos' doctor shortage, he maintained. He called it "bitterly ironic" for that report to suggest that "to work 60 and more hours a week in the ghetto and be fairly paid" is "suddenly prima facie evidence of wrongdoing."

Dorman and Hill also urged statewide panels by which medical men themselves review the cost, quality and need for other doctors' services.

Both said doctors have been smeared by intimations that anyone earning \$25,000 or more a year from federal health programs is profiting unduly.

SENATE—Friday, June 19, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Creator Spirit, who at the beginning said, "Let there be light; and there was light," shine into and search out all the dark places of our time—the places of poverty, of injustice, of despair, and spiritual desolation. Reawaken us to the faith of our fathers, that people of all ages and all faiths may cherish all true values of the past and become alive to all redemptive measures for the future. Illuminate our personal lives by a fresh allegiance to Him who said, "You are the light of the world—Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father." Give us strength and wisdom to do the good works which bring light and healing and redemption.

In the Master's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
 PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
 Washington, D.C., June 19, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
 President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 18, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 931, to skip No. 932, and then take up Calendar Nos. 933, 934, 935, and 938.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT AGE FOR CAREER MINISTERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The bill, S. 3691, to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, to lower the mandatory retirement age for foreign service officers who are career ministers was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3691

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 631 and 632 and the headings thereto of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1001 and 1002) are amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS WHO ARE CAREER AMBASSADORS

"Sec. 631. Any Foreign Service officer who is a career ambassador other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall be retired from the Service at the end of the month in which he reaches age sixty-five and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821, but whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such an officer's service for a period not to exceed five years. Any such officer who hereafter completes a period of authorized service after he reaches age sixty-five shall be retired at the end of the month in which he completes such service.

"PARTICIPANTS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM WHO ARE NOT CAREER AMBASSADORS

"Sec. 632. Any participant in the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, other than one occupying a position as chief of mission or any other position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who is not a career ambassador shall be retired from the Service at the end of the month in which he reaches age sixty and receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 821, but whenever the Secretary shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such participant's service for a period not to exceed five years. Any such officer who hereafter completes a period of authorized service after he reaches age sixty shall be retired at the end of the month in which he completes such service."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by section 1 shall be effective upon enactment, except that any Foreign Service officer who is or becomes a career minister and who is not occupying a position to which he has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall be mandatorily retired for age in accordance with the schedule below and receive benefits under section 821 of the Foreign Service